

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, August 7, 2000  
Volume 36—Number 31  
Pages 1721–1786

## Contents

### Addresses and Remarks

#### Florida

David Barksdale Senior Center in Tampa—1756

Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee

Dinner in Palm Beach—1775

Luncheon in Tampa—1760

Reception in Palm Beach—1770

Permanent normal trade relations with China in Tampa—1754

#### Illinois

Association of Trial Lawyers of America in Chicago—1749

Democratic National Committee luncheon in Chicago—1743

#### Massachusetts

Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee

Dinner in Cambridge—1733

Reception in Boston—1728

New York City, luncheon for Hillary Clinton—1740

Radio address—1739

Rhode Island, luncheon for Representative Patrick J. Kennedy in Barrington—1721

### Bill Signings

Cross-Border Cooperation and Environmental Safety in Northern Europe Act of 2000, statement—1782

### Communications to Congress

Iraq, national emergency, letters—1728

Mexico-U.S. treaty on delimitation of the continental shelf in the western Gulf of Mexico, message transmitting—1721

### Communications to Federal Agencies

Potential Electricity Shortages in California, memorandum—1783

### Interviews With the News Media

Interview with Kelly Ring of WTVT television in Tampa—1766

### Notices

Continuation of Iraqi Emergency—1727

### Proclamations

Helsinki Human Rights Day—1781

### Statements by the President

*See also* Bill Signings

California, Federal action on potential electricity shortages—1783

Colombia, upcoming visit and assistance—1784

Colorado initiative to close the gun show loophole—1781

Death of Sister M. Isolina Ferre—1782

Gun buyback initiative—1753

National debt—1770

Stability Pact for Southeast Europe—1727

### Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1786

Checklist of White House press releases—1786

Digest of other White House announcements—1784

Nominations submitted to the Senate—1786

**Editor's Note:** The President was in Martha's Vineyard, MA, on August 4, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

## WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

## PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, August 4, 2000

**Message to the Senate Transmitting  
the Mexico-United States Treaty on  
the Delimitation of the Continental  
Shelf in the Western Gulf of Mexico  
With Documentation**

*July 27, 2000*

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States on the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf in the Western Gulf of Mexico beyond 200 nautical miles. The Treaty was signed at Washington on June 9, 2000. The report of the Department of State is also enclosed for the information of the Senate.

The purpose of the Treaty is to establish a continental shelf boundary in the western Gulf of Mexico beyond the outer limits of the two countries' exclusive economic zones where those limits do not overlap. The approximately 135-nautical-mile continental shelf boundary runs in a general east-west direction. The boundary defines the limit within which the United States and Mexico may exercise continental shelf jurisdiction, particularly oil and gas exploration and exploitation.

The Treaty also establishes procedures for addressing the possibility of oil and gas reservoirs that extend across the continental shelf boundary.

I believe this Treaty to be fully in the interest of the United States. Ratification of the Treaty will facilitate the United States proceeding with leasing an area of continental shelf with oil and gas potential that has interested the U.S. oil and gas industry for several years.

The Treaty also reflects the tradition of cooperation and close ties with Mexico. The location of the boundary has not been in dispute.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this Treaty and give its advice and consent to ratification.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
July 27, 2000.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 28. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Remarks at a Luncheon for  
Representative Patrick J. Kennedy  
in Barrington, Rhode Island**

*July 28, 2000*

Thank you. You have to be 33 years old to have that kind of energy. [*Laughter*] You know, Patrick is—he celebrated his 33d birthday, but he looks like he's about 23. And he told me that story that he told you. You remember when he started his remarks, and he talked about being grounded? He was supposed to go to his birthday party, he was grounded by bad weather. The first time he said it, I thought one of his parents made him stay home for bad behavior. [*Laughter*]

Don't pay any attention to this. We're all just jealous, Patrick. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Bill and Nancy for opening this magnificent home, this beautiful, beautiful place and for giving me a reason to come to Barrington. I hope I can come back. I really think it's amazingly beautiful.

I want to thank Senator Reed for being here with us and for his truly outstanding leadership in the Senate. I want to thank Ted and Vicki and Joan for being here to support you, Patrick. You deserve it, and everything you said about your dad is the truth.

When Patrick was up here bragging on his father, I leaned over to Bill and I said, "You know, you would be hard-pressed to name 10 people who have served in the United

States Senate in the entire history of America who have done as much good as Ted Kennedy has." And I think that's very important.

I want to thank your former Governor, Bruce Sundlun, and your former Lieutenant Governor, Bob Licht, for being here and Lieutenant Governor and all the mayors and legislative leaders. And there are a lot of people here who helped me from the beginning, but I want to especially mention Joe Paolino and Mark Weiner and Ira Magaziner, and his whole family, for being there for me when I was just what then-President Bush referred to as a Governor of a small southern State. [Laughter] And I was so naive, I thought it was a compliment. [Laughter] And I still do. [Laughter]

I want to thank Patrick for giving me the opportunity to come here for him today. I don't know anybody in the Congress who works as hard as he does. I don't know anybody in the Congress any more devoted to his or her constituents than he is. I don't know anybody in the Congress on the good days and the bad—and believe me, you get your fair share of both down there—who is always up, always there, always focused, always doing what he's supposed to do. You should be very proud of what he has done with his life for you and the people of Rhode Island.

I think it is truly astonishing that one family has produced so many people so devoted to public service. His cousin Joe did a great job in the Congress. His cousin Kathleen, I think, is the finest Lieutenant Governor in the entire United States—unbelievable in terms of what she's been able to accomplish.

But over the long run, if you will just stick with him, his energy and consistency and dedication will make a unique mark on Rhode Island and on the United States, and I want you to stick with him. And besides that, he's now raised all this money for these other people in Congress, and they owe him everything. I mean, if we get the majority, they may move the Capital up here, for all I know, just because of Patrick.

Let me just say, too, on behalf of Hillary and myself and Al and Tipper Gore, I want to thank the people of Rhode Island for being so good to us and to me, especially, through

two elections. I stopped at a school on the way here and read my radio address for tomorrow morning. And on the way out, I stopped and shook hands with a lot of the folks that were on the street. And I turned to one of my aides and I said, "You know, I want to spend the rest of my Presidency in places where I got 60 percent of the vote or more." [Laughter] I was pretty happy. But I'm very grateful to you.

And I guess the remarks that I make today are sort of like what we at home used to call preaching to the saved. But I hope you will listen to what I have to say, and I know that you have friends, not only all over this State but all over this country, and I hope you will share it with them.

Some people think I'm crazy for doing what Patrick said I am. I've never worked harder in an election for myself than I'm working for our Congressmen and our Senators and our Vice President. And of course, there is one particular Senate race I have more than a passing interest in. [Laughter] But I'm doing it for other reasons.

I come here today a little—actually, reluctant to speak because the night before last was the first time in 2 weeks I've been to bed before 2 in the morning, because we were at Camp David working on those Middle East peace talks. And I'm not sure I'll remember what I say when I finish, because I'm still a little tired.

But let me tell you what I think is most important and what I'm concerned about. Patrick had it right; I always tell people there's only three things you need to know about this election: It is a big election; there are big differences; and only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are. What does that tell you about who you ought to vote for?

But let me explain what I mean by that. We're in the midst of the longest economic expansion in our country's history, including those which occurred in wartime, and we've had no war. All the social indicators are going in the right direction. The welfare rolls are half what they were when I took the oath of office. The crime rate is down. The teen pregnancy rate is down. We have the highest homeownership in our history. We have the lowest poverty rate among single-parent

households in over 40 years, the lowest unemployment rate among women in 40 years, the lowest minority unemployment rate ever recorded. Our country is at peace, and we've been able to be a force for peace from Northern Ireland to the Balkans to the Middle East and throughout the world.

So what's the big deal here? Well, in my lifetime we have never had such an opportunity to build the future of our dreams for our children. But we also know that even though things are going very well, nothing stays the same forever. America is changing rapidly and there are big challenges out there on the horizon.

So I say to you, not in any morose way—I mean, I'm just as happy as the next guy—and for my age, I'm almost as happy as Patrick. But I want you to listen to this. How a nation deals with a unique moment of prosperity, a democracy, is just as stern a test of our judgment, our values, our wisdom, our character as how we deal with adversity.

You didn't have to be a genius in 1992 to know we needed a change. This country was in trouble. We quadrupled the debt of the country in 12 years and reduced our investment in the future.

We were in trouble. The country was becoming more divided socially. The politics of Washington were stuck in sort of a partisan verbal warfare. And we had to change. Now, people think there may be no consequences to change one way or the other.

Well, what I want to say to you is this: However people vote this year, they will be voting for change. There is no doubt about that. The question is, what kind of change will we vote for? This is profoundly important. And countries are like individuals. There's not a person out here who is over 30, at least, who can't remember one time, at least one time in your life when you made a huge mistake, professionally or personally, not because things were going so poorly but because things were going so well you thought there was no penalty to the failure to concentrate. It's almost endemic to the human condition.

And I see a lot of people nodding their heads. You know I'm telling the truth. That's the only thing I'm worried about this year. People just sort of saying, "Gosh, things are

going so well, you couldn't mess this economy up with a stick of dynamite. There doesn't seem to be much difference to me; all these people are so nice.

Now, that basically is the message of our Republican friends. Near as I can tell, the message of the Bush campaign is just that. "I mean, how bad could I be? I've been Governor of Texas. My daddy was President. I own a baseball team." [Laughter] "They like me down there. Everything is rocking along hunky-dory. Their fraternity had it for 8 years. Give it to ours for 8 years because we're compassionate and humane, and we're not like what you think about us from watching the Congress for the last 5 years." That's the message isn't it? Blur, blur, blur. Blur all the distinctions.

Well, there is a difference. And that's what I want you to tell every friend you've got all over this country. Whatever decision the American people make, I will gladly accept. And I've already had so many gifts in life I could never complain about anything that happens to me. But I want my country at least to make this decision knowing what the alternatives are and knowing that there are consequences for whichever choices we make. And let me just give you a few.

There is a huge difference in economic policy—massive. This year already, the Republicans have passed—not this calendar year but over the last 12 months—tax cuts totalling over a trillion dollars. They're going to Philadelphia to advocate another tax cut way over a trillion dollars. In other words, they propose to spend 100 percent and more of the projected surplus over the next 10 years on tax cuts—all of it. And if they enact them in a year, which they would do if they had the White House and the Congress, they would be there, but the money may not be.

Let me ask you something. Did you ever get one of those letters in the mail, like from Ed McMahon saying you may have won \$10 million. Now, if you got one of those letters and you went out the next day and committed to spend \$10 million, you ought to be for them. If not, you had better stick with us. [Laughter] You think about that.

If I ask you what your projected income is for the next 10 years—you think hard. How much money are you going to make over the

next 10 years? If I ask you to come up here right now and sign a binding contract to spend 100 percent of it, would you do it? If you would, you ought to support them. If not, you better stick with us. *[Laughter]* Now, you're laughing, but that's exactly what the deal is.

Now, our proposal is different. We say our tax cuts are less than 25 percent of their \$2 trillion-plus. But we give more tax benefits to the 80 percent of the American people that are the first four quintile. Which means in the short run, most of you who can afford to be here today would do better with theirs than with our ours. But 80 percent of the American people would actually get more relief under our plan than theirs, even though we spend less than a fourth as much.

And what do we do with the rest? Well, first of all, we're not going to spend it because we don't know if it's there yet. Secondly, we think some money should be invested in the education of our children. We have the largest number of our students in our country's history. We have the most diverse number of our students in our country's history. We have kids in these classrooms bursting at the seams, and we want to make them smaller. We have school districts who can't afford to build buildings, and we want to help them build them. We have kids that come from troubled homes and troubled neighborhoods that need after-school and summer school programs, and we want to give them those opportunities.

And I've been working on education seriously now for more than 20 years—seriously—going to schools, talking to teachers, talking to principals, watching how they work. And I can tell you we know more now than we have ever known about how to turn these failing schools around.

I was in a school in Spanish Harlem the other day in New York City, where 2 years ago 80 percent of the children were reading and doing math below grade level. Today, 74 percent of the kids are reading and doing math at or above grade level.

I was in a school in rural Kentucky the other day, where—*[laughter]*—your national ambitions are being outed, Patrick; you've got broad bases. *[Laughter]* So I was in this school in rural Kentucky, over half the kids

on the school lunch program; 4 years ago, one of the failing schools in Kentucky—4 years. They went from 12 percent of the kids who could read at or above grade level to almost 60 percent. They went from 5 percent of the kids who could do math at or above grade level to 70 percent. They went from zero percent of the kids who could do science at or above grade level to almost two-thirds in 4 years, and they're one of the 20 best elementary schools in Kentucky. We can turn these schools around, folks. We can do that.

But you can't say that we care more about our children than anything, but we're going to take the money and run. You've got to save some to invest in them. And in health care and in the environment and in science and technology and in health research.

So I think this is very, very important. And it's not like you hadn't had a test run here. We tried it their way for 12 years, and we've tried it our way for 8 years, and you do have a record here. You cannot let this election unfold as if there are no differences in economic policy and no consequences to the decision the American people will make.

The same thing is true in health care policy. We're for a strong Patients' Bill of Rights that Senator Kennedy has led the way on, and they're not. We're for a Medicare prescription drug program that all the seniors in our country who need it can buy into. We would never create Medicare today—never—without prescription drugs. Only reason it was done that way in 1965 is that health care in 1965 was about doctors and hospitals.

Today, if you live to be 65, your life expectancy is 82 or 83 years. And it's about keeping people out of the hospital and keeping them healthy and extending the quality as well as the length of their lives. We would never create a Medicare program without prescription drugs today. And Patrick's right—there are people every week who choose between medicine and food. This is a big difference. And what kind of country are we going to live in?

There are big differences on environmental policy. You know, one of the things I'm proudest of is that we have set—Al Gore and I have set aside more land for future preservation for all time than any administration in American history except those of the

two Roosevelts in the continental United States—ever.

Now, in the primary, their nominee said if he were elected, he would reverse my order creating 43 million roadless acres in our national forests, something that I think would be an environmental terrible mistake. So make no mistake about it. There are big differences here. We believe you can improve the environment and grow the economy, and they basically don't.

And there are big differences in crime policy. Patrick talked about this. The previous President vetoed the Brady bill, and I signed it. And they said—and we lost the House of Representatives, in part, because I signed that and the assault weapons ban, because they scared all the gun owners in the country into believing we were going to take their guns away, and they wouldn't be able to go hunting.

And I went up to New Hampshire, I remember, in 1996, where they beat one of our Congressman. And I said, "I know you beat him because he voted with me on the assault weapons ban and the Brady bill." And I told all these hunters, I said, "Now if you missed a day in the deer woods, you ought to vote against me, too, because he did it for me, because I asked him to. But if you didn't, they didn't tell you the truth, and you need to get even." And they did, and we won.

But the point I want to make to you is, there is a huge philosophical difference. The head of the NRA said the other day that they would have an office in the White House if the Republican nominee won. What I want you to know is, they won't need an office, because they'll do what they want anyway. And we just have a difference of opinion there.

Al Gore, he wants to close the gun show loophole and require child trigger locks and stop the importation of these large capacity ammunition clips and require people when they buy handguns to have a photo ID license showing they passed a background check and they know how to use the gun safely. And I think that's the right thing to do, and they don't—and they honestly don't. But I do.

And the American people need to know there are consequences here. And if they

agree with them, then they ought to vote for them. But at least they have to know. There are big differences on our ideas about what it means to be genuinely inclusive. We're for the hate crimes legislation. Some of them are, but most of them aren't. We're for employment nondiscrimination legislation. We can't get it passed. Senator Kennedy has been working on it a long time. We're for raising minimum wage, and they're not. I'll bet they will do that before the election, because that's pretty hard to defend. But we've been trying to do it for over a year.

Ted Kennedy has worked with them for over a year trying to raise the minimum wage—the strongest economy we've ever had. The last time we did it in '96, they said it was a job killer disguised in kindness. They said it would cost a terrible number of jobs. And that would lead to skyrocketing juvenile crime because we were going to throw all of these kids out of work by raising the minimum wage. And since they said that, we've got 11 million more jobs and the lowest juvenile crime rate we've had in 25 years. It's not like we don't have any evidence here.

So what's the point I'm trying to make? There are big differences, and we have evidence. So how could Patrick not be successful in his quest if people really believe there are no consequences to their failure to concentrate if they really don't know what the differences are?

You know, we wouldn't be around here after 226 years—224 years—if the American people weren't right most of the time. That's the whole premise of democracy. Most of the time, the people get it right on most of the issues if they have enough information and enough time.

So that brings me to this next point I want to make. Their clear objective is to blur all these differences. You don't ever hear them talking about that primary they had for President, do you? You don't ever hear them talking about the commitments they made in the primary. They just want to make like that never happened. But it did happen.

Now, here's what I want to say to you. I think we can have a positive election. I'm tired of 20 years of politics where people try to convince the voters that their opponents were just one step above car thieves. And

you're tired of it too, aren't you? The whole politics of personal destruction: We ought not to have that.

We Democrats ought to stand up and say, "As far as we know, from the Presidential nominee to the Vice Presidential nominee, to their candidates for Senate and the House, our opponents are honorable, patriotic people who differ with us. And we think elections are citizen choices about the differences." That's what we ought to do.

But they have now taken—but after basically trying to be the beneficiaries of this torrent of venom we've seen in American politics over the last 20 years, they have now taken the position that we're running a negative campaign if we tell you how they voted.

We see this in New York all the time. "If you tell people how I voted, you're being negative. I've got a right to hide my voting record from the people." [Laughter] "How dare you tell them how I voted." This is a choice, folks. It will have consequences. I know it's a beautiful place, and the economy is doing great. We're all in a good humor, but I'm telling you, we might never have another time in our lifetimes when the country's in this kind of shape, never have a chance like this to build the future of our dreams for our children.

And I want to say this about my Vice President really quickly—I guess he still is; I haven't seen him in a while—[laughter]—there are four things you need to know about Al Gore. One is, there have been a lot of Vice Presidents who made great Presidents. I believe President Kennedy's Vice President, Lyndon Johnson, did some magnificent things for this country. I believe Theodore Roosevelt made a great President. I know Thomas Jefferson made a great President. I know Harry Truman made a great President.

There have been a lot of Vice Presidents who were great Presidents. There has never been a person who, as Vice President, did as much for the economy, for technology, for the environment, for economic opportunity for poor people, and to help this country to have a foreign policy that promotes peace. Nobody has ever remotely done what Al Gore has done as Vice President of the United States—ever in the history of the country. You need to know that. And the

American people need to know that. It's not even close.

The second thing you need to know is, he's got a good economic policy, and I already explained that. When you talk to people, you tell them the Ed McMahon story. Just tell them: You get that letter saying you may have won \$10 million; if they want to spend it, they should support the other side; if not, they ought to stick with us.

The third thing that I think is important is, is he understands the future. And we need somebody in the White House who understands the future. The Internet, the human genome developments, that's all great and exciting, but your banking and financial records are on somebody's computer. Don't you think you ought to be able to say yes before somebody gets them? Your little gene map is going to be out there somewhere. Don't you think that you ought to know that nobody can use it to deny you a job or a raise or health insurance? You need somebody that understands the future.

The last thing is, he wants to take us all along for the ride. And I want to be in a country where my President wants us all to go, blacks and whites and browns, the abled and the disabled, straights and gays, everybody that will work hard, play by the rules, obey the law, do their part. I think we ought to all go along for the ride.

You've got your great secretary of state running for the United States Congress, in part because we now live in a country which says we will not look at people who have physical disabilities as if they are disabled; we will look at their abilities and think about what they can do and what they can do. Let me just—I'll close with this.

I graduated from high school in 1964, and our country was still profoundly sad because of President Kennedy's death. And I was a white southerner who believed in civil rights. And we were in the middle of the longest—what was then the longest economic expansion in American history. And I really believed—I was 17 and wide-eyed, and I really believed that all the civil rights problems would be solved in Congress and in the courts. And I thought that economy was on automatic, and it would go on forever, and all the poor people in my native State would



be able to get an education and get a job. And everything was just going to be fine.

But we lost our concentration. And we got in trouble. And by the time I graduated from college, we had 2 years of riots in the streets. It was 9 weeks after Martin Luther King was killed—about 6 weeks—9 weeks after President Johnson said he couldn't run for reelection because the country was so divided, and 2 terrible days after Senator Kennedy was killed. And just a few months later, the previous longest economic expansion in American history was history. It doesn't take long to live a life. Nothing ever stays the same. We should be happy and thank God every day that we live in this time. But the test is, what will we do with it?

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:03 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to luncheon hosts William and Nancy Gilbane; Representative Kennedy's father, Senator Ted Kennedy, and the Senator's wife, Vicki; Representative Kennedy's mother, Joan Kennedy; Lt. Gov. Charles Fogarty and former Lt. Gov. Richard A. Licht of Rhode Island; former Mayor Joe Paolino of Providence; Mark Weiner, treasurer, Democratic Governors' Association; former Senior Adviser to the President for Policy Development Ira Magaziner; former Representative Joseph P. Kennedy II; Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend of Maryland; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush of Texas. Representative Kennedy is a candidate for reelection in Rhode Island's First Congressional District. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

### **Statement on the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe**

*July 28, 2000*

A year ago in Sarajevo I joined leaders from Europe, other nations, and the international financial institutions to launch the Stability Pact for Southeast Europe in the aftermath of the Kosovo conflict. Working closely with our partners in Europe and the region, I am proud of the progress that we have made. We have promoted political and economic reform, provided financial support

for the region's economic development, and advanced the membership of southeast European countries in key international institutions.

Europe, appropriately, is leading this effort, joining international financial institutions in pledging over 85 percent of assistance to the region. The United States is doing its part by contributing to more than 50 Quick Start projects to improve infrastructure, attract investment, reinforce human rights, and fight crime and corruption. This week we established with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development a \$150 million fund to promote small and medium businesses in the region. We also launched a \$150 million regional equity investment fund to invest in telecommunications, consumer goods, and other sectors in the region. Initial reforms have led to the beginning of renewed economic growth this year. Private investment is up, and inflation is down. Democratic values and structures are growing stronger. In Kosovo, the first democratic local elections will be held this fall.

While results since the Stability Pact summit are encouraging, the last aggressive dictatorship in Europe remains a threat to peace. We will continue to support the democratic opposition in Serbia and the people of Montenegro until they can take their rightful place among the free and prosperous people of Europe. With continued commitment by both the region and the international community, we can achieve our common vision of building a peaceful, undivided, and democratic Europe.

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

### **Notice—Continuation of Iraqi Emergency**

*July 28, 2000*

On August 2, 1990, by Executive Order 12722, President Bush declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Iraq. By Executive Orders 12722 of August 2, 1990, and 12724 of

August 9, 1990, the President imposed trade sanctions on Iraq and blocked Iraqi government assets. Because the Government of Iraq has continued its activities hostile to United States interests in the Middle East, the national emergency declared on August 2, 1990, and the measures adopted on August 2 and August 9, 1990, to deal with that emergency must continue in effect beyond August 2, 2000. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Iraq.

This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
July 28, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., July 31, 2000]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on August 1. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Iraq**  
July 28, 2000

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iraqi emergency is to continue in effect beyond August 2, 2000, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Iraq that led to the declaration on August 2, 1990, of a national emergency has not been resolved. The Government of Iraq continues to engage in activities inimical to stability in the Middle East and hostile to United States

interests in the region. Such Iraqi actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure on the Government of Iraq.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the National Emergency With Respect to Iraq**  
July 28, 2000

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Remarks at a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Reception in Boston, Massachusetts**  
July 28, 2000

Thank you very much. First, I want to thank Bob and Elaine, and Tess and Shane, who were with me a few moments ago, asking me questions. Where did Shane go? [Laughter] He probably thinks he's heard this speech before. [Laughter]

And I want to thank them, as Dick did, for the example they've set for all of us in their generosity and their giving. This year their taking off is only the latest example of a lifetime commitment to thinking about other people and drawing meaning from their lives by helping other people to have more meaning in theirs.

I want to thank all the Members of the House who are here; my good friend Joe Moakley. I always tell everybody, Joe is Hillary's favorite Congressman. She thinks that Joe Moakley will be waiting for her in heaven when she dies—[laughter]—thinks he'll be the gatekeeper there. [Laughter]

I want to thank Patrick Kennedy for a magnificent job as the head of our Congressional Campaign Committee. We just went to Barrington, Rhode Island, today, before we came here, for an event for Patrick. There were several hundred people there, including his father and Senator Reed. I think he's all right. They haven't been able to find anybody to run against him yet—[laughter]—so I believe he'll survive.

I want to thank Congressman Markey for his leadership in the Congress and his friendship to me over these 7½, 8 years. And Congressman Capuano, I thank him for running when Joe Kennedy left the House and for his service. And most of all, I want to thank Dick Gephardt, who never got dispirited after we lost the House in '94, understood quite clearly that we lost it because we did the right things and the American people couldn't have known by 1994 whether we were right or not. They had been told for 12 years that there was such a thing as a free lunch while we quadrupled the debt, got ourselves in a deep hole, had high interest rates and a weak economy.

And we had to change. We took a cold shower, and we paid for it in '94. We also paid for it because we passed the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. And we lost a dozen rural Democrats because the NRA convinced them we were going to end hunting and sport shooting and everything legal that ever happened. And by '96, they knew that they hadn't been told the truth, and we began our long climb back.

And in '98, thanks to Dick's strong leadership and the fact that we had a clear and

unambiguous message, we picked up five more seats in the House of Representatives. And you should know, it was only the second time in the 20th century that the President's party had picked up seats in the House in mid-term but the first time since 1822 that it had happened in the sixth year of a President's term. And that is a great tribute to Dick Gephardt, to his leadership, to the trust and confidence that the men and women in our caucus in the House of Representatives have in him.

I said to myself, when he said he wanted to be like Tip O'Neill when he grew up, I wonder how many places outside Boston he's given that speech? [Laughter]

I can tell you this, I believe he will be the Speaker after these elections. And no one has ever worked harder, been more well-prepared, had better values, or deserved it more. And it has been an enormous honor for me to work with him, and I only hope when I leave town, he'll be holding the gavel, and I think he will. And I thank you for being here.

I told the people in Rhode Island today, and I will say again to you, I wish I could spend the rest of my Presidency only in places where I got over 60 percent of the vote. [Laughter] Then I would get to spend more time in Massachusetts.

Dick already mentioned Alan Solomont and the Schusters and so many others of you who have helped me over the years. I am very grateful to all of you, grateful for what you have been to Hillary and to me and to Al and Tipper Gore.

But I just want to take a couple of minutes to talk about the future. I think the single, most important issue in this election is, what do we intend to make of this moment of prosperity? What are the Sager's making of their moment of prosperity? They're going around the world and helping other people. What are we going to do as a nation to do that?

I think, then, what we have to do is to make sure, first, that we answer it to our own satisfaction and, secondly, that we make sure that the American people believe that's what the election is about, and thirdly, they've got to know what the differences are between the two candidates for President and the House candidates and the Senate candidates.

I cannot even begin to convey the depth of my conviction about the importance of this election. It is every bit as important, maybe more important, than the 1992 election. Everybody knew then we had to change. The country was in the ditch. We were in trouble economically. We were divided socially. We had no clear mission of our responsibilities around the world that was kind of comprehensive. And the politics of Washington, DC, was like watching, I don't know, "Wayne's World" or something—[*laughter*]*—*to most of us who lived out here in the world, the real world.

So we've been busy turning it around, and I'm very grateful for the shape the country's in now, that almost all social indicators are going in the right direction, that we've got the strongest economy in history, that we've been a force for peace and freedom throughout the world. I am grateful. But all the best stuff is still out there if we make the most of this moment of prosperity.

And in order to do it, it is necessary for the American people to choose. That's what an election is. It's basically, democracy is handed back over to the bosses for a day, and you choose. And in order to choose wisely, you have to know what the differences are. And I've got this little mantra I tell everybody all the time. It says, only three things you really need to know about this election: One is, it's profoundly important; two is, there are big differences; three is, only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are. What does that tell you about who you ought to vote for?

And it's really true. After giving us 20 years or more of the harshest kind of mean personal attacks—right up through this Republican Presidential primary, I might add, where they attempted—the people who won attempted to perform reverse plastic surgery on Senator McCain—they did that. Now all of a sudden, they want to be sweetness and light. They say they want a positive campaign. But what they define as a negative campaign is if we tell people how they voted. That's their definition of a negative campaign. [*Laughter*] Hillary has already had two ads run against her in New York saying, you know, "Oh, she's being so mean. She's telling

people how I voted. How dare her do that?" [*Laughter*]

Now, we're all laughing. But you know I'm telling the truth, don't you? They're trying to blur the differences. We have to clarify them. Why? Because that's what elections are about; they are choices. And we may never have another chance like this to build the future of our dreams for our kids.

And there are choices. I'll just tell you what some of them are. I'm convinced, first of all, there is this huge economic choice. They have already passed a trillion dollars' worth of tax cuts, and they're going to Philadelphia to advocate another, what, \$1.4 trillion or something, all of the projected surplus and then some. Now, they're doing it in salami tactics so you don't know this. And they've got a good argument. "We've got this surplus. We're going to give it back to you. It's your money, and we're prosperous, and we'll give it back to you."

Our argument's more complicated. Our argument is, "Well, we can't give it all back to you because, number one, we don't have it yet; the surplus hasn't materialized. So we want to give about 25 percent of what they do, but 80 percent of the people will get more money out of ours than theirs." Most of you in this room tonight wouldn't, but most of the American people would. And we've got to save some, because we've got to invest in education, in health care, in research and technology, and the environment. And we have responsibilities around the world that we have to fulfill and not just defense responsibilities—responsibilities to help alleviate the burdens of the poorest people around the world and deal with a lot of the problems around the world.

And so we have to save some of this money, because we need to invest in our future because we don't have it yet. But our tax cuts are good. They're just smaller and better targeted toward education and child care and lower income working people with a lot of kids, toward long-term care and saving for retirement. You see, it takes me longer to make our side.

But here's what I'd like to tell you about it. Did you ever get one of those letters from Publishers' Sweepstakes in the mail, Ed McMahon letters? "You may have won \$10

million"? Well, if you ever got one of those letters and you went out the very next day and spent that \$10 million, you should support the Republicans. [Laughter] But if you didn't, you had better help Dick Gephardt and the Democrats and stick with us, and we'll keep this economy going. [Applause] Thank you.

Now, we're all laughing. This is a profoundly serious issue. It's not like we hadn't had any experience. We tried it their way for 12 years; we tried it our way for 8 years. We had the lowest minority unemployment rate in history, the lowest female unemployment rate in 40 years, the lowest rate of poverty among single-parent households in 45 years, the highest homeownership in history, 22 million jobs. Look, this is not rocket science. We tried it their way.

And in a very nice way, a little slice here, a little slice there, they're saying, "Let's try it again. Remember when we told you the Government was bad; it was your money; and we're going to give it all back to you? Let's try it again." The country has been in good shape so long that a lot of voters have forgotten what it was like when we started here. This is very important.

The second thing you need to know is that we just have a totally different philosophy about how society ought to work. We believe that we are interdependent, that we have mutual responsibilities to one another. That's why we're for the Brady bill, and the previous Republican President vetoed it. That's why we were for the family and medical leave bill, and the previous Republican President vetoed it.

That's why we want to—right now—that's why we wanted to ban assault weapons and the congressional majority now, they were all against that. It's why we're for a Patients' Bill of Rights, and they're against it. Why we're for Medicare prescription drugs for all the people in the country, the seniors that need it, and they're not for that kind of program. It's why we believe we can grow the economy and improve the environment. And basically, they don't believe that. They don't approve of a lot of the environmental things that I've done. And their nominee promised that one of the things he'd do if he got elected President is to reverse my order creating 43 mil-

lion roadless acres in the national forests. So these are important issues.

Now, if you want to reverse our environmental policy and if you want to go in that direction, then you should do it. But you shouldn't let a single soul you know anywhere in America—I know I'm in Massachusetts now, but you have got a lot of friends around the country—you shouldn't let anybody that you know cast an unknowing vote. If the American people—my objective in every race I ever ran—and I guess I've run all the ones I'm going to now—[laughter]—but my objective in every race I ever ran was to make sure everyone who voted against me knew exactly what he or she was doing, because I figured if everyone who voted against me knew exactly what he or she was doing, I could have no complaint. That's democracy. If I lost, then the people had made a wise and considered choice, and I just lost. And if I won, I knew I had a mandate to act. Their objective in this election is to obscure the differences so that people do not understand the implications of the choice.

You never hear them talking about what they said in the primary, do you? You never hear any of that again. You never hear them explaining that, yes, we're going to give you this big tax cut, but it's going to take away all the projected surplus.

But you must understand that there are choices here and consequences to those choices. The next President is going to have between two and four appointments to the United States Supreme Court. Both candidates on the Republican ticket believe *Roe v. Wade* should be repealed. If you think it should be repealed, you should vote for them. If you don't, you should think about it.

But you shouldn't listen to all this sort of syrupy talk about how somehow they will—listen, I'm not saying bad things about them, personally. I think their convictions are there. I think this is an honest disagreement. I don't believe in the kind of politics they spawned for 20 years trying to convince people your opponents are just one step above car thieves. I don't believe that. I think these are honest differences. But do not be abused. When people get this job I just had for 8 years, they pretty much do what they say

they're going to do in the campaign, and they try to do what they think is right.

Now, just because they're not talking about it doesn't mean they've changed. So you have to consider these things.

The Republican Senate defeated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I was the first world leader to sign it, and they beat it. The first treaty that's been beat since the treaty taking America into the League of Nations at the end of World War I—unbelievable. Everybody in the world thought we had slipped a gasket. And a lot of the pundits said, "Well, they just didn't want to give Bill Clinton the victory." It's not my victory to protect our children from the dangers of nuclear war, number one. And number two, I'm telling you, a lot of those people don't believe in arms control. I'm not saying anything bad about them. They're good people. They honestly don't believe in it. But they won't be out there telling you about it. I bet you won't hear a speech at the Republican National Convention about how terrible the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is. But they beat it.

So what you have to decide is what you want America to be like. I know you're all here supporting these folks, but frankly, your support is not good enough. You've got to go out and talk to everybody you can reach between now and November and not just in Massachusetts but in States we might win or we might not win and congressional districts we might win or we might not win, and tell them this.

And the last thing I want to say is this, the most important thing of all. The longer I live, the more convinced I am that the most important thing in any great society is the sense of community, of interdependence that people have, the sense of mutual responsibility they have. I don't think it's possible to enjoy real freedom without responsibilities to the people in your community and without a sense of responsibility to the larger world community, increasingly.

We're for the hate crimes legislation. Their leadership isn't. We're for the employment nondiscrimination legislation. Most of them are opposed to it. We want stronger civil rights enforcement. Most of them don't.

The Federal appellate court district with the most African-Americans in the entire country is the fourth circuit, comprising North and South Carolina. There has never been an African-American on that court, ever. I have tried for 7½ years to appoint one. Jesse Helms said no, and all the Republicans said, "It's fine with me." It's never happened. We are different.

We don't have to have a bad campaign. I think we should posit it that Governor Bush and Mr. Cheney and all of their candidates are fine, good, decent people who just differ with us. But we should not let them get away with having this sort of smokescreen to try to play on this era of good feelings to convince people that there are no consequences to this election. They are big. They are deep, and they are profound.

And I can tell you, we lost our majority because we did what was right for America. There are Republican Congressmen now who will go out and campaign for reelection in their districts bragging on all the highway money they got or the things they voted for, for the schools or this, that, and the other thing. They could have done none of that if Democrats alone hadn't passed the economic plan of 1993, which turned this whole thing around.

These people deserve to be in the majority. It will happen if people understand it's a big election, there are real differences, and they understand what the differences are. We owe that to the kids. We owe that to the future. We may never have another time in our lifetime when America is in this good a shape. We cannot squander it. And if we build on it, the best is still out there.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:20 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Robert and Elaine Sager and their children, Tess and Shane; Alan D. Solomont, former national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; Gerald Schuster, former president, and his wife, Elaine, director of issues, Continental Wingate Company; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush of Texas and Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Remarks at a Democratic  
Congressional Campaign Committee  
Dinner in Cambridge, Massachusetts**

*July 28, 2000*

Well, Swanee, if I had a bell right now, I would certainly ring it. *[Laughter]* You've been ringing my bell for years now. *[Laughter]* She's been very great for my personal maturity, Swanee has, because I know every time I see her coming, she's going to tell me about something else I haven't done. *[Laughter]* And it takes a certain amount of grown-upness to welcome that sort of message—*[laughter]*—with the consistency with which she has delivered it over the years. *[Laughter]* Actually, I love it. You know, I mean, I sort of hired on to work, so somebody has to tell me what to do from time to time. It's great.

Let me say, first I want to thank Swanee, and thank you, Charles, for welcoming us in your home, for the work you did in Austria, the work you did in the Balkans. And Swanee, I want to thank you especially for the work you've done to mobilize women in the cause of peace in the Balkans and the work you've done with Hillary, with women all over the world in trouble spots. That's one of the things I think that Hillary is the proudest of, that she's done in the 8 years we've been in Washington, trying to mobilize women who are not part of political factions but interested in human beings and how they treat each other and how they raise their children to try to be forces for peace in the Balkans, in Northern Ireland and lots of other places, and I thank you for that.

Even though I was in a hurry to go to Chelsea's ballet that night, you might like to know that that little piece of rock from St. John Mountain in Croatia, where Ron Brown's plane crashed, along with a couple of screws and a piece of metal from that airplane, is one of my most precious possessions, because I loved him like a brother. And it's on my little table in my private office in the White House, next to a miniature painting of my mother done by the famous Russian artist Tsereteli, that Boris Yeltsin gave me when I flew to Russia on the night that I buried my mother.

I say that not to be morbid but to kind of get into what I am doing here tonight. For one thing, I want to say, Congressman Gephardt and Congressman Kennedy and all the Massachusetts Members that are here are taking a big chance on me tonight because I haven't been to bed in 16 days—*[laughter]*—and I, frankly, don't know what I'm saying. *[Laughter]* And tomorrow I won't remember it.

And the only thing I can think of that they allowed me to come here, after being up—you know, I've been up in the Middle East peace talks, and then I flew to Okinawa for 3 days and came back, over there and back in 3 days—and then I said, "Well, surely, you're going to let me rest." And they said, "No, you missed 2 weeks of work, and the Congress is fixing to leave, and we've got a big vote, and you've got to do this, that, and the other thing."

So the last 2 days I stayed up until about 2 o'clock at night working, too. So I'm not quite sure where I'm at. I think the only reason they're doing it is, I know Joe Moakley will call me next Monday and say, "I am so glad you committed another \$50 million to the Boston Harbor." *[Laughter]* Capuano will call with a commitment; Markey will call—Lord knows what Ed will tell me I committed to. *[Laughter]*

So I'm honored to be here, even though I'm a little tired. And I'm here because I think these people ought to be in the majority. I'm here because, in a larger sense, I think that everything I have done this last 8 years, in a way, has been preparing America for this moment. And now we're all dressed up, and as a country we haven't decided where to go.

What do I mean by that? Eight years ago you didn't have to be a genius to know that we needed to make a change. I mean, the previous policies had quadrupled the debt of the country in 12 years and reduced our investment in our people and our future at the same time—that's pretty hard to do—increased interest rates to the point that the economy was stagnant and the political debate was sterile and hostile. The governing party in the White House had basically followed the politics of division.

So the American people took a chance on me. In the words of my predecessor, I was, after all, just the Governor of a small southern State. I was so naive when I heard him say that, I thought it was a compliment. [Laughter] And I still do. [Laughter]

So we set about making changes. And what Dick Gephardt said is right. I do feel somewhat personally responsible for the fact that we lost the Congress in '94. Why? Because everybody could talk about getting the country out of the economic ditch, but it's one thing to talk about it and quite another thing to do once you get in as deep a hole as we were in. We had a \$300 billion deficit. We had quadrupled the debt in 12 years. And the Republicans had made taxes toxic, and we already cut a lot of spending—it's hard to cut more. And yet, we had to do both.

And so without a single vote to spare, we basically changed the economic and political history of America in August of 1993 by adopting an aggressive program to get rid of the deficit. We carried it by one vote in the House, and then we carried it by one vote in the Senate—Al Gore. As he always says, whenever he votes, we win. [Laughter] So we carried it by a vote in the House and a vote in the Senate. I signed it. And the Republicans, who now want you to give them the White House back and leave them in control of the House and Senate, said it would be the end of civilization as we know it.

And you ought to go back and read the stuff they said about our economic plan. "Oh, it would have another recession. It would lead to high interest rates. It would be horrible. Everything would be awful." It's unbelievable what they said. The same crowd that wants you to give it back to them now. And not a one of them voted for it.

And then in '94, we adopted a crime bill that banned assault weapons, on top of the Brady bill, which had been vetoed in the previous administration and I signed. And then the same crowd went out into the country, where all the hunters are, and told them that we were fixing to come get their guns. And we adopted the bill late in '94. And then we tried to do something on health care, and they decided, after promising me we would work together, that they didn't want anything

to happen because they wanted an issue in the election. And those three things were enough to cost the Democrats the House in '94, and the Senate. And I feel personally responsible, because I drove them relentlessly to do as much as we could to turn this country around.

And then, since '95, we've actually had quite a lot of success working together to try to continue to do good things for our country. And one of the reasons that I think Dick Gephardt ought to be the Speaker is that he never thought about quitting. He never thought about giving up. He never walked away from his responsibilities to his people or to our country. And because he has done what he has done, we were able to stay together and work together, and we gained again in '96. And in '98, we picked up seats, the first time since 1822 the party of the President had gained seats in the House election in the sixth year of a Presidency.

So we're just like the "Little Engine That Could" now; we're only five seats, six seats away from being in the majority. But I don't want it for them, in spite of everything. I owe it to them, but I want it for you and for the rest of this country. And that's why, believe it or not, we actually have a chance to win the Senate, too. And I believe that, notwithstanding the present polls, I expect Vice President Gore to be the next President.

But what I want to say to you is, we can win them all or lose them all, and it is hanging in the balance. I'm really grateful for everything Swanee said, but right now I don't care too much about my legacy. Somebody will take care of that down the road. And then it will be written four to five times, over and over again through the generations. I finally read a biography the other day claiming Ulysses Grant was a good President, and I think the guy was right. He said he was a pretty good President and a brilliant general and a greatly underrated person, and I'm persuaded by the historical evidence it was right and took 100 years to get it right, if that's true.

So you can't worry about that. The press thinks I worry about it, but—you know what I have on my desk in the Oval Office? A Moon rock that Neil Armstrong took off the Moon in 1969. You know how old it is?



Three-point-six billion years. Somehow, I have the idea that 3.6 billion years from now, even George Washington may not be known to too many people. [Laughter] It's just all a matter of perspective.

And I keep it there to make me feel humble and uplifted at the same time, because what it means is that every second of time today is worth just as much as it was then, in fact, more, because they have a more interconnected, more well-developed society, but we're all just passing through here. And what really matters is what we do and what's in our hearts and whether we act on it.

So I will say again, what I care about is not the legacy. The country is in great shape. We've got the strongest economy we've ever had. All the social indicators are moving in the right direction. We have no crisis at home or threat abroad that is paralyzing us. We have lots of national self-confidence.

But the only thing that matters is, what do we intend to do with this? That's all that matters. Nothing else matters. And here we have this millennial election, when the most disturbing thing to me is not today's or yesterday's or last week's or next week's polls or this or that race. The most disturbing thing to me is the repeated articles which say that the voters are not sure there's any significant difference in these candidates, and "they all seem pretty moderate and nice-sounding to me. And what difference does it make? Maybe I won't vote. Maybe I'll vote for the other guy. Maybe I'll vote for this one. Who knows?"

And what I wish to tell you is, this is the product of a deliberate strategy that you must not allow to succeed. There are three things—I say this over and over again—the people have heard me give this speech are getting sick of me saying it—there are only three things you need to remember about this election. It is a huge election. What a country does with unique prosperity is as big a test of its vision, its values, and its common sense as what a country does in adversity.

Number two, there are big, big differences, honestly held between good people running for President and Vice President, running for Senate, running for the Congress—big differences.

Number three, for reasons that you have to figure out, only the Democrats want you to know what those differences are. [Laughter] Now, you laugh, but it's true. Remember the Republican Presidential primary? Al Gore is still giving the same speech now as he was giving in the Democratic primary. They performed reverse plastic surgery on poor John McCain in that Republican primary. You don't ever hear them talking about that, do you? Oh, it's all sweetness and light now. [Laughter]

Now, I'm having a little fun tonight—[laughter]—but I'm dead serious. I am dead serious. There are real differences, and they matter to your life. It is very important that voters, when they have a chance to vote, understand that they are making decisions. Elections are about decisions. Decisions have consequences. I'll just give you one or two examples. I made a list of eight or nine here. Maybe I'll give one or two. I have fun doing this.

Let's take the economy. There was a huge article in USA Today not very long ago saying, voters see very little difference between Bush and Gore on the economy. And I thought, "Oh my God, what am I going to do? Very little difference?" Every one of them opposed everything we ever did on the economy—until we were doing so well we then were able in '97 to get a bipartisan balanced budget signed because we had plenty of money, so we could satisfy the Republicans and the Democrats.

But let's look ahead: the economy. Here's their policy. Their policy is to revert to their old policy on the backs of our new prosperity. They say, "Look at this huge surplus that the Government has. That's not the Government's money. It's your money. Vote for us. We'll give it back to you." Sounds pretty good, doesn't it? I can give their speech as well as they can. [Laughter] "It's not the Government's money. They'd mess up a two-car parade. You pay. You earned it. Go vote for us. We'll give it back to you." [Laughter] I can sing that song.

We say over \$2 trillion in tax cuts over a decade is too much. It's the entire projected surplus, and then some. And frankly, too much of it goes to folks who can afford to come to events like this. Our plan costs

less than 25 percent as much, gives more benefits to 80 percent of the people, and leaves us some money left over to invest in the education of our children and the health care of our seniors and lengthening the life of Social Security and Medicare and dealing with science and technology and the biotechnology revolution and our environmental responsibilities and our health care responsibilities and in getting this country out of debt by 2012, which will keep interest rates at least a percent lower than their plan for a decade, which is another \$250 billion effective tax cut and lower home mortgages, \$30 billion in lower car payments, \$15 billion dollars in lower student loan payments.

Now, it takes longer to say our position than theirs. But the difference is pretty great. And I always tell—and the most important thing—what they want to do is to spend next year, if they have the White House and the Congress, the projected surplus. And as I said yesterday and I'll say this again: Did you ever get one of those sweepstakes letters in the mail from Ed McMahon or somebody, saying, "You may have won \$10 million"? Did you ever get one of those? Well, if you went out the next day and spent the \$10 million, you really should support them in this election. But if you didn't, you better stick with us so we can keep this economy going.

Now, this is—I'm dead serious. Who in the wide world—if I asked you to estimate your projected income over the next 10 years, how much money are you going to make over the next 10 years? Just think. Now, if I made you a very attractive deal to come in and sign it all away tomorrow morning, would you do it? Would you legally obligate yourself to all your projected income for a decade to do it? That's what they want us to do. That's what this tax cut deal is. It will mean higher interest rates. It will mean neglecting our responsibilities to the future. It will undermine the economy.

We have enough money in our tax cut to give you big incentives to invest in poor areas in America that haven't been developed yet, big incentives to have more money invested in school construction and school repairs all across America, and big incentives to help people send their kids to college, pay for child care, have retirement savings, pay for

long-term care for the elderly and disabled. We can do this. We can have a tax cut. But this is crazy to give away all this projected income just because it sounds good at election time. "You made it. It's your money. I'll give it back to you."

And let me just say one other thing. It isn't like we haven't had a test run here. You just had a test run of 8 years, right? And you got a 30-year low in unemployment and 22 million jobs, and it's pretty good. Now, they had 12 years before. And they had a nice little economic runup there for a while when they were running all those bills up.

I used to have a Senator named Dale Bumpers from Arkansas, who said, "If you let me write \$200 billion worth of hot checks every year, I'd show you a good time, too." [Laughter] So, for a while—but what happened? It got to where we were so in debt that we got no economic stimulus out of that deficit spending; we got higher interest rates; we had to keep cutting back on the things we wanted to invest in; and the economy was in the ditch by the time we took office.

Now, I am telling you, this is huge. We want to keep the prosperity going, and we want to extend it to neighborhoods and people in Indian reservations and poor rural towns where it hasn't reached yet. So it's huge. I'll give you just one or two other examples.

In education, they say they want to spend as much money as we do, but they don't want to spend it on what works. They don't want to have standards. They don't want to require people to turn around failing schools or shut them down. Dick Gephardt gave a passionate defense of education. I just want to give you—I'll just give you one example. I could keep you here all night with it.

I was in Spanish Harlem about 2 weeks ago in a grade school that 2 years ago had 80 percent of the children reading below grade level, doing math below grade level—2 years later, new principal, school uniform policy, high standards, accountability. In 2 years, there are 74 percent of the kids reading and doing math at or above grade level. Listen, these kids can learn; they can do fine. And you can turn these schools around, but you can't give them speeches and then not give them any money.

I will give you another example: crime. Everybody is against crime. The Republicans say we stole their issue when we started talking about crime. I didn't realize that you had to—I've never seen either a rap sheet or a report on a victim that had a box for party registration. [Laughter] This is our issue. Where I came from, it was a human issue.

Their deal about crime was, talk real tough and lock everybody up. You heard Dick talking about it. I thought we needed a more balanced approach, which included stopping people from committing crime whenever possible. And that's why we went for the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, the 100,000 police on the street. And by and large, they opposed everything we tried to do. They said it was no good, terrible, you know, the whole 9 yards.

Now, here in this election, the head of the NRA says if their candidate for President wins, they will have an office in the White House. I didn't say that. That's not a negative campaign. I'm simply repeating what he said. They won't need an office in the White House, because they'll do what they want anyway. They won't have to go that trouble, because they believe that way.

Now, we've had a test run. The previous administration vetoed the Brady bill, and the group that wants to win now in the House and in the White House and in the Senate, they don't want to close the gun show loophole. They don't want to require mandatory child trigger locks. They don't want to ban large scale ammunition clips from being imported. And they certainly don't want to do what the Vice President does, which is to say if you want to buy a handgun in America from now on, you ought to at least do what you have to do when you get a car. You ought to have a photo ID. You ought to have a criminal background check, and you ought to prove you can use the equipment you're about to buy.

Now, they just don't believe that. But it's not like we haven't had a test run. Gun crime has dropped by 35 percent in America since we passed the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban—35 percent. And that's with this gaping loophole. Half a million felons, fugitives, and stalkers haven't been able to get handguns, and nobody has missed a day

in the woods hunting. [Laughter] Now you laugh about it. They beat a dozen of our Members, didn't they, Dick? At least a dozen. They took them out. So you have to choose. The point I'm making is, this is a choice.

One other issue, both the candidate for President and Vice President—this affects the Senate, too, more than the House—say that they don't like *Roe v. Wade*, and they want to repeal it. And Vice President Gore said he likes it and thinks we ought to keep it. And you don't have to believe that anybody is a bad person. I think they just have an honest difference here. But there is going to be between two and four judges of the Supreme Court appointed next time, that the Senate will have to vote on. You have to decide how much that means to you. But don't listen to all this sort of let's, you know, pretend that there are no differences here. There are honest differences.

In foreign policy there are honest differences. We believe we ought to do more to relieve the debt of the poorest countries in the world. We believe we ought to invest more in AIDS and malaria and TB. And we're struggling to build bipartisan consensus for this. We believe we were right in Kosovo, and most of them didn't. And I still think we were right in Kosovo and Bosnia, and I'm glad we did it. We believe we ought to have a comprehensive test ban treaty, and they don't. There are big differences. Now these are honest differences.

But I'm telling you folks, I know you may not want to have a serious seminar at this hour of the night on Friday night, but I am telling you this is a huge election. There are gaping differences. You cannot, in good conscience, permit anyone you know to vote without being aware of the differences and the consequences to the children of this country based on the choices that will be made.

What I believe is, if everybody knows what the deal is, then we ought to all be happy with the results. When Hillary asked me if I thought she ought to run for the Senate, I said, "It depends on whether you're willing

to risk losing and whether you've got something to say that's bigger than you." The answer to both of those was yes, so off she went. And I'm really proud of her.

But when she calls in from the road or I call her, I say, "Remember, your objective in an election is to make sure everyone who votes against you knows what they're doing." You think about that. If everyone who votes against you, every vote you lose, knows what he or she is doing, then democracy has worked. And none of us have any complaints.

Now, you know and I know and they know that if the American people know what they're doing in this election, that is, if they understand what the real choices are, they will vote for the Democrats. They will make Dick Gephardt the Speaker. They'll make Tom Daschle the majority leader. They'll make Al Gore the President, because they know what I have told you is true. And that's why you have this attempt in the other party to create a collective amnesia about their primary and to blur all over these differences. I don't blame them. If I were them, I would do the same thing. It's their only shot.

But we ought to get a whoopin' if we let them get away with it, if you'll allow me to use a colloquialism from my small southern State. [*Laughter*] This is a big deal. I'm not even going to be here, but I have done all this work in the hope that if we could turn America around, we would be in a position to build the future of our dreams for our kids.

Why should we even be fighting about this? We ought to be saving Social Security and Medicare and adding a prescription drug benefit for seniors who need it. We ought to be making sure that every kid in this country who wants to go to college can go. We ought to be making sure that there's economic opportunity for the first time on these Indian reservations and in the Mississippi Delta and the Appalachians and all these places, in the inner-city neighborhoods. There's plenty to do out here.

We ought to be figuring out how we're going to put a human face on the global economy so that those of us like me that believe we ought to have more trade will be able to prove it lifts people up and raises wages

and creates jobs everywhere. We ought to be thinking about these big things.

What are we going to do about global warming? One of the reasons I'm for Al Gore for President, besides the fact that he's been my Vice President and the best Vice President in history is, we need somebody in the White House that understands the future. That's what we ought to be talking about.

Al Gore was telling me about climate change 12 years ago. Everybody was making fun of him. Now, even the oil companies admit it's real. He was right. He sponsored legislation in the House to make the Internet more than the private province of physicists, and a lot of people in this room are making a pretty good living because of that.

And now all your financial and health records are on somebody's computer somewhere. Don't you think you ought to be able to say yes before somebody else gets them? Wouldn't you like somebody in the White House at least who understood that?

The other day we had this great announcement on the human genome—did you see it?—with the sequencing of the human genome. I had to read for a year so I would understand what I was saying in that 30 minutes. Do you think someone—when you get a little genetic map, and all of you that are still young enough to bear children, when your children come home from the hospital in a couple years, everybody will just have their little genetic map that will tell you, you know, what your child is likely to be like, what kind of problems you're vulnerable to. It's scary and hopeful.

But do you think your little genetic record should be used by somebody else without your permission to deny you a job or a promotion or a pay raise or health insurance? Wouldn't you at least like to have somebody in the White House that understands that?

This is a big election, and all this great stuff is out there. And you must not allow people to take this casually. Dick Gephardt will be the Speaker if the people of this country understand what the issues are, what the differences are, what the stakes are. And that's why I've tried to be, even though I

am in a semi-coma tonight and will not remember this tomorrow morning—[laughter]—I hope I have been somewhat persuasive.

The kids of this country deserve this. Look, in my lifetime, we've only had one other economy that was almost this good in the sixties. And we took it for granted, and we thought we didn't have to nourish that moment. And it fell apart in the national conflicts over civil rights and the war in Vietnam. And all of a sudden, it was gone. And now we've waited over 30 years for this chance again. We don't want to blow it.

And if we don't, believe me, the best is still out there. I've had a great time doing this. Massachusetts has been great to us. If you really want to tell me that you appreciate what I've tried to do, make him the Speaker, make Al the President, make Daschle the majority leader, and you will make America's best days ahead.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:23 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to former U.S. Ambassador to Austria Swanee Hunt and her husband, Charles Ansbacher, dinner hosts; former President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush of Texas and Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney; Ed McMahon, spokesperson, Publishers' Clearinghouse Sweepstakes; and Wayne LaPierre, executive vice president, National Rifle Association. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

## The President's Radio Address

July 29, 2000

Good morning. This weekend marks the start of the summer recess for Members of Congress. Many are heading home to their districts, and most Republicans are meeting in Philadelphia for their party's convention.

But wherever they go, I hope they will be thinking of the millions of Americans for whom summer vacations are not an option, the millions who work all summer long, all year long, earning no more than the minimum wage.

I want to talk to you today about giving these hard-pressed Americans a much-deserved raise and helping them to live the

American dream. The face of the minimum wage is the face of America. Every one of us knows at least one person who works for minimum wage. It might be a member of your family. It might be the person who cares for your children during the day or serves you lunch at the shop on the corner or cleans your office every night.

Seventy percent of the workers on the minimum wage are adults; 60 percent are women; and almost 50 percent work full-time. Many are their families' sole breadwinners, struggling to bring up their children on \$10,700 a year. These hard-working Americans need a raise. They deserve it. They've earned it.

I've always believed that if you work hard and play by the rules, you ought to have a decent chance for yourself and for a better life for your children. That's the promise I made when I first ran for President, and that's the basic bargain behind so much of what we've done in the years since, from expanding the earned-income tax credit for lower income working people to passing the Family and Medical Leave Act, from increased child care assistance to health care for children to helping millions and millions of Americans move from welfare to work.

That's also why, in 1996, we raised the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour over 2 years. It's high time we did it again. In fact, it's long overdue.

More than a year ago now, I proposed to raise the minimum wage by \$1 over 2 years, a modest increase that merely restores the minimum wage to what it was back in 1982 in real dollar terms. Still, it's no small change. For a full-time worker, it would mean another \$2,000 a year—\$2,000 more to pay for a child's college education, to cover critical health care, to pay the rent. And for a year now, the Republican leadership has sat on that proposal.

Back in 1996, the last time we raised the minimum wage, some of these same Republicans called it, and I quote, "a job killer cloaked in kindness." They said it would cause—again, a quote—"a juvenile crime wave of epic proportions." Well, time has not been kind to their predictions, and neither have the numbers. Our economy has created more than 11 million new jobs since we last

raised the minimum wage. And study after study shows that a raise in the minimum wage is good not only for working families; it's good for our entire economy, especially at a time of labor shortages when we want to increase incentives for all Americans who can, to find work.

So this time, unlike the last time, the congressional majority knows better than to speak against raising the minimum wage. This time, instead of arguing the facts, the leadership is playing legislative games, stalling action, and stifling debate. Already, these delays have cost the minimum wage worker more than \$900 in hard-earned pay. To paraphrase Shakespeare, they've come to bury the minimum wage, not to raise it.

For working Americans, the wait grows longer. As recently as this week, the majority in Congress was still talking about raising the minimum wage, but they couldn't bring themselves to actually do it. In the last hours before their recess, they were still working overtime to give tax breaks to the tiniest, wealthiest fraction of America's families and still doing nothing for the 10 million people who would benefit from a boost in the minimum wage.

This weekend Republican leaders gather in Philadelphia. From their seats inside the convention hall, I hope they'll stop a moment to think of Americans outside that hall—Americans working in the restaurants, the shops, the hotels of Philadelphia, working hard for the minimum wage.

If Republican leaders really want to make their compassion count, they ought to join me in getting back to business and raising the minimum wage. I hope the majority will join the Democrats to seize this moment, to stop the delays, to work with me to help our working families.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 1:03 p.m. on July 28 in Room 606 at Barrington High School, Barrington, RI, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 29. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 28 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

## **Remarks at a Luncheon for Hillary Clinton in New York City**

*July 29, 2000*

Thank you. First of all, I would like to thank all of you for making us feel so welcome. In particular, I thank you, Albert Kwak and John Ha and Gilliam Kim, for your words and your support. I would also like to thank those of you in the audience who worked so hard on this event, especially Janet Lee, thank you, and my good friend Tony George from Cleveland. I thank Lee Ho-Yeon for the song. Wasn't the song beautiful? Let's give her another hand for the beautiful singing. *[Applause]*

I want to say just a couple of things, if I might, today. First of all, I appreciate the previous remarks by Gilliam Kim about the relationship of the United States and Korea and South Korea during my time. I have been to Korea many times to see the people, the leaders, and the United States forces there. We have worked very hard to encourage the new direction in North Korea and to support President Kim as he has worked to break down the barriers of the past and to build a more peaceful future. And I certainly hope it will be successful.

I feel very good about what has been done, and I appreciate the support that this new direction has received from other nations in the area. So I hope you will all keep your fingers crossed and keep working for it, because it would be a very good thing to make the future in the 21st century safer for all of the children of the Korean Peninsula and all of Asia.

The second thing I would like to say is that I have worked very hard for these last 8 years to make America a place open and welcoming to all immigrants, a place of genuine opportunity that supported people who worked hard and took care of their families and contributed to their communities.

I have worked against discrimination against all people who come to America from other countries, and I've tried to remind our fellow Americans that all of us came here from somewhere else. Even our native populations once crossed a landmass that no longer exists between the Northwest United

States and the northeastern part of Asia. So I welcome you here, and I thank you for your participation in this event.

The last thing I would like to say is that I heartily endorse what was said earlier by Mr. Kim about hate crimes. You know, even though America has made great progress in overcoming our past of discrimination on the basis of race or ethnic origin or religion, we still have instances in our country where people are subject to discrimination. And we all know it. We can remember by name some of the victims: James Byrd, dragged to death in Texas; Matthew Shepard, stretched out on a fence in Wyoming. We know that a former basketball coach in Chicago was killed because of his race. We know that a young Korean Christian was killed walking out of a church by a fanatic who said he belonged to a church that did not believe in God but believed in the supremacy of his race.

We know, thankfully, these people are a very small minority in our country, but we know they have to be rebuked and stopped. And that is why we support the hate crimes legislation. Hate crimes are not like other crimes. People are singled out for victimhood simply because they belong to a certain race or a certain religion. In California not very long ago, a bunch of little Jewish children were shot at just because they were going into their school, and a Filipino postal worker was killed because he was Filipino and because he worked for the Federal Government.

There are very few of these people in our country, thank goodness, but we should pass hate crimes legislation to make it clear that we will not tolerate discrimination against people simply because of who they are. And I hope all of you will support that.

Now, looking ahead to the future, let me say that I think that Korean-Americans can have a big impact on this election, in New York and in the United States, if you are willing to participate, not—yes by coming to fundraisers, and we thank you for that—but also by reminding Americans of what an important occasion this election is. In great democracies, people tend to make good decisions in times of crisis because they know that there is trouble all around and that change is required. In 1992 the American

people gave me a chance to be President, because there was trouble all around and they knew we had to change.

But sometimes when things are going very well—when the economy is in good shape, when, as you said, there are fewer people on welfare, when crime is down, when we are moving toward greater peace in the world—people may think there is no consequence to the election; there are no differences between the candidates; everything comes wrapped up in a pretty package; and no one takes the trouble to open it to see what's inside in terms of what an election is about.

And the reason I say you can make a contribution is, it is the nature of immigrants to the United States from Korea, as you pointed out, to work hard, to try to strengthen family and community, and to always think about the future in good times as well as tough times.

Democracies tend to make some of their worst mistakes, if you look throughout human history, not in the tough times but in the good times—in the good times. Why? Because it's easy to stop concentrating. It's easy to stop working. It's easy to stop trying. It's easy to be fooled into thinking that there are no serious consequences to a choice.

So my message to you today is that I believe that Hillary decided to run for the Senate here because she knew how serious this election was, because she had spent all of her life as an adult working for children and families and better education and health care. She wrote a best selling book and gave away 100 percent of the profits to children's charities because she thinks that that's the most important issue for anybody's future and because she understood that we had worked for 8 years to turn the country around. And we're moving in the right direction, but now we have the chance of a lifetime to build the future of our dreams for our children.

The only thing I worry about in this election, the only thing, is that people will either believe it doesn't make much difference because times are going along so well—what difference does it make who gets elected President or who gets elected to the Senate or who gets elected to the Congress, or that

because things are going along so well and our opponents are making such a determined and clever effort to blur the differences, that they simply won't understand what the differences are.

So I ask you not only to support us in this way, as you have today, and within the Korean-American community, but to talk to other people in this country with whom you come in contact and remind them that good times are great blessings that impose special responsibilities and that we may never have another chance to have an election where we can pick people and policies that will build the most brilliant future we can imagine, that elections are decisions by voters and citizens which have far-reaching consequences on how we will live and that the good times election are as big a test of our judgment and our values and our national character as the tough times election.

Let me just give you a couple of examples. Beginning with the Vice President, and including Hillary and all of our Democrats, we think our economic policy is pretty good. We think it works for America, and we think it should be continued and intensified in the years ahead. What do I mean by that?

We want to give the American people a tax cut that we can afford based on what we think our surpluses will be in the years ahead, to help people educate their children, pay for child care, pay for long-term care for the elderly and disabled, save for retirement. We want to save some money to invest in education and health care and scientific and technological research. And we want to keep paying down the national debt until America is out of debt, to keep interest rates low so people like you can borrow money to start businesses, to buy homes, to send your children to college at lower interest rates. That's our policy.

Their policy is to say to the American people, "We have a projected surplus over the next 10 years of \$2 trillion. It is your money. You worked for it, and we are going to give it all back to you right now."

Now, that sounds very good. What is the problem with it? It is a projected surplus. So if we cut taxes right now by the amount of money we think we're going to have over the next 10 years, we will cut taxes whether

the money comes in or not, and we will have no money for education, for health care, for investment in the future. And we will not pay this debt off, and then, if the projected income figures are wrong, we'll be back in deficits, making the same mistakes we were making 8 years ago when the American people gave me a chance to change this country. That is the big economic issue.

Their policies will raise interest rates. Our policies will keep them lower. Our policies will give people an effective tax cut of hundreds of billions of dollars in lower home mortgage rates, lower business loan rates, lower college loan rates, lower car payment rates—clear choice; huge difference. Most people don't know it yet. You can help.

We have differences in education policy, in health care policy. We want everybody to have affordable health insurance that they can buy. We want older people on Medicare to be able to buy prescription drugs. We want to lengthen the life of Social Security and Medicare so that when all of the people in the so-called baby boom generation retire, we do not impose a burden on our children and their ability to raise our grandchildren.

We want to have a country where the streets are safe for people to walk. We have a much lower crime rate now than we did when I took office. But I'm sure you believe it's still too high—huge difference in the two parties, from the Presidency to the Senate candidates to the Congress, on what we would do.

We believe there are still too many criminals and children who have handguns, and it leads to too much violence. We believe that we should strengthen our laws in that regard, to do more rigorous background checks on people who try to buy guns. We think if someone buys a handgun, they ought to get a license like you do with a car, that says you have passed a background check and you understand how to use the gun safely. They strongly disagree with it.

It's a big choice. There is no point in pretending that there is not a difference here and that it won't have consequences. So these are just some of the issues that I wanted to bring up. We favor the hate crimes legislation, broad and inclusive. Their leadership is opposed to it—big difference.



So what I ask you to do is, number one, keep being a good example for all Americans with your work ethic and your strong families and your contributions to community; number two, thank you for being here to help Hillary; she will be the most outstanding advocate New York could possibly have for children and families, for jobs and health care and education; number three, remind your fellow Americans not to go to sleep this election year, that what you do in good times is just as important, maybe more important, as what you do in bad times in an election, that elections are choices with real consequences.

I am absolutely convinced if the American people and the people in New York clearly understand it's a big election, there are big differences, and what the differences are, that Hillary will be the next Senator; Vice President Gore will be the next President; and America's best days are still ahead. That's what I believe.

Now I would like to introduce the First Lady, my wife, by telling you that, as far as I know, I have now run my last race. I will never be a candidate for anything again. I will spend my time helping other people to run for office and to serve our country.

I have had, since I was a very young man, the opportunity to work with literally hundreds of people in public life who were running for office, first helping them to get elected, then getting elected myself. Now I am returning to my original role as a citizen.

Of all the hundreds of people I have known, including many Presidents and candidates for President, I have never known anyone who had the same combination of intelligence and passion and knowledge and ability to get things done for children, for families, for education, for health care, than my wife does.

She has never presented herself for public office before. She's spent 30 years working for other people and other causes before they were popular, when no one else paid attention to them. And I frankly am grateful that she has been given the chance by the people of New York to run for the Senate, and I hope for the sake of this State and the children of our country that she will have a chance to serve, because she can do things

and she knows things that no one else now in our public life can do and know, just because of the life she has lived.

It is a very good thing that she is doing, although I'd just as soon we were out relaxing somewhere. *[Laughter]* I am glad that she wants to do it. I am glad that you're helping her, and I hope you will help her every day between now and November, because it's the best thing that could possibly happen for the people and the future of New York and for our country.

Please bring my wife up now to the floor. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:57 p.m. in the Empire Room at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to luncheon host Albert N. Kwak; John Sehe Jong Ha, president, Korean American Senior Citizens Society of New York; Gilliam Kim, president, Korean American Association of America; and President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of the First Lady.

### Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in Chicago, Illinois

July 30, 2000

Well, thank you all for being here today. I'm delighted to be in this beautiful new restaurant. One of the owners of this restaurant, Phil Stefani, is a good friend of mine, and in honor of my coming, he went to Rome. *[Laughter]* I don't know what it means, but it's probably a pretty good choice. *[Laughter]*

I want to thank Senator Dick Durbin, one of the finest human beings and one of the bravest people and one of the most eloquent people who has served in the United States Congress in my adult lifetime, since I've been covering. He is an extraordinary human being, and I'm grateful that he is my friend, and I thank him.

Thank you, Mr. President Middleton, and thank you, Fred Baron, Leo Boyle, Anthony Tarricone, all the other members of the ATLA, for being here today. I want to thank all the candidates who have come here today. And I know—Fred told me he'd already introduced them, but this is a very interesting

group of candidates. We have Ron Klink and Debbie Stabenow running from the House of Representatives for the United States Senate. And they can both win, and they should win if you help them. I saw earlier Deborah Senn and Ed Bernstein. I think Brian Schweitzer is here. We have a whole slew of House candidates. One of them, John Kelly from New Mexico, went to college with me, so I have a particular interest in seeing him make good. *[Laughter]* But he was also a distinguished U.S. attorney.

But we have this incredible group of people running for the House. They can win the majority. And now we have an extraordinary new Senator from the State of Georgia, Zell Miller, who will be running for election in November. And believe me, we can win not only the House but the Senate, as well, if you give them enough help.

And a number of you have helped the Senate candidate that I care the most about, in New York—*[laughter]*—and I want to thank you for that. And if you haven't, I hope you will, because it's a big old tough State. And they're trying to take us out, and I think she's going in, with your help. So I hope you will, and I thank you very much for that.

Let me say, normally I don't speak from any notes at these events, but I want to do it today for a particular reason. You make a living making arguments, persuading people, knowing what's on people's minds, understanding the predispositions that they bring to any given circumstance. And this is a highly unusual circumstance, so I want to talk to you about it today, because with the conventions of the Republicans in Philadelphia, the Democrats in Los Angeles, we're beginning to have this election in earnest.

The first thing I want to do is to say a simple thank you. You've been thanking me; I want to thank you. I want to thank you for being so good to me and Hillary and Al and Tipper Gore for these 8 years. I want to thank you for supporting the civil justice system and, when it was threatened, the Constitution of the United States. I want to thank you for supporting ordinary citizens, the people who can't afford to come to fundraisers like this but work in places like this, people who can't afford to hire lobbyists in Washington to plead their case. And I want to

thank you again for supporting the candidates here and those who are not here who can help to give us a new majority in the Congress.

The second thing I'd like to say, with some humility, I guess, is that your support has been validated by the record of the last 8 years. This country is in better shape than it was 8 years ago. It's stronger than it was 8 years ago, and people are better off than they were 8 years ago.

And as Senator Durbin said, yes, part of it is economics. We have the longest economic expansion in history and the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, the strongest growth in 40 years, the highest homeownership in history, all of those statistics. But it's more than that as well. This is a more just society. We have the lowest African-American and Hispanic unemployment rates ever recorded, the lowest female unemployment rates in 40 years, the lowest single-parent household poverty rate in 46 years. We have rising scores among our students in schools, the first time in history the African-American high school graduation rate is equal to that of the white majority, the highest percentage of people going on to college in our history.

We have cleaner air, cleaner water, safer food. We set aside more land in the lower 48 States than any administration in history except those of the two Roosevelts. And we proved that you could improve the environment and the economy at the same time. The welfare rolls have been cut in half. The crime rate is at a 30-year low. Gun crime has dropped 35 percent in the last 7 years. So it's about more than money. It's about who we are as a people and how we live together.

Many of you whom I met earlier mentioned my work in the last couple of weeks on the Middle East peace process. I've been very honored to be part of making a more peaceful world, from the Balkans to the Middle East to Northern Ireland, trying to reduce the threat of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction and trying to build a positive set of relationships with countries throughout the world. And America is better positioned than it was 8 years ago.

Now, here's the most important thing: Now what? What are we doing with this prosperity? That's my answer and your answer,

but how do we get it to be America's answer? What are we going to do with this remarkable moment of prosperity? Will we use it as a precious, once-in-a-lifetime gift to meet the big challenges and seize the big opportunities of this new century? Or will we do what often happens in democracies, when things are going well, and break our concentration and sort of wander through this election?

The outcome of the election, who wins, depends on what people think the election is really about. Now, on our side, we've got people led by Vice President Gore who have brought America back and who have great ideas for keeping this positive change going. On their side, they have people led by their Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees who are speaking in very soothing, reassuring ways about compassion and harmony and inclusion. Gone are these harsh personal attacks that dominated their politics from '92 to '98.

You watch their convention. I bet butter wouldn't melt in their mouth for the next few days. *[Laughter]* It is appealing as a package and a terrific marketing strategy. But that obscures the differences between the candidates for President, the candidates for Senate and Congress, and, fundamentally, the different approaches between the two parties. And it is just what they mean to do, because on issue after issue, this ticket is to the right of the one that Al Gore and I opposed in 1996.

So this election—you just need to know three things about it. It is a big election; there are big differences; and only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are. What does that tell you about who you ought to vote for? *[Laughter]*

It is a big election, but a lot of people don't think so. Story after story after story that our friends in the press write indicate that people aren't sure what the differences are between the candidates for President. "Do they have different approaches to crime and gun safety? Do they have different approaches to the economy? Do they really have different approaches to health care? They both seem like compassionate people. Who could mess this economy up, anyway? I mean, it's so strong. And maybe there aren't any real con-

sequences, and so maybe we should give the other side a chance. We had it for 8 years."

Now, how many times in your own life—if you're over 30 years old, every person in this room over 30 at some point in your life has made a mistake, not because your life was so full of difficulty but because things were going along so well you thought there was no penalty to the failure to concentrate. A lot of you are nodding your head. That's true. You know that's true. If you live long enough, you'll make one of those mistakes.

And countries are no different than people. Things are going along well; they kind of relax, feeling good. I'm glad everybody is feeling good. But wouldn't it be ironic if, as a consequence of the good feeling of America now and our yearning to sort of have everything come out all right, that the people that made the decisions and paid the price were punished for the error they helped to bring about? Now, that's basically the issue in this election.

And so I say to you, I don't blame our friends in the Republican Party. If I were them, I would be trying to obscure the differences between us, too, because it's the only way they can win. *[Laughter]* I mean, it's a good strategy, and they're doing it very well. And they've got a great package, and they just hope nobody ever unwraps the package to look and see what's inside.

Now, this is America, and people should do whatever they think they can do to get elected. But if that happens and if the electorate goes into the polling place in November without knowing what the real differences are, that's our fault, not theirs. You can't blame them for trying to get elected. They want back in in the world's worst way. And all those interest groups that are behind them want back in in the world's worst way. And you know some of the things they want to do if they could get the White House and the Congress, don't you? And you can't blame them. They're just doing what they're supposed to do; they're trying to win.

And the American people almost always get it right, almost always—for over 220 years now, if they have enough time and enough information to make a good choice. That's our job. And that's your job, because you make arguments for a living, so you are

uniquely positioned to influence the outcome of this election, not so much by your money as by your insight and your persuasiveness and understanding. And you have to take it on.

Let me just give you an example. What you've got to convince people of is, "Look, an election is a decision. It's a choice, and choices have consequences. If you like the consequences of your choice, you should vote for that person. But let's just look at some of them. Number one, on economic policy, the goal ought to be to keep this recovery going and spread its benefits to more people, right? Okay. What's our policy? Our policy is: Stay with what works; keep investing in America's future, in education, in science and technology and health care; keep paying down the debt; get us out of debt, so the interest rates will stay low; save Social Security and Medicare for the baby boom generation and add a drug benefit to Medicare, and give the people a tax cut we can afford and still do that stuff—for college education, for long-term care, for child care, for people with a lot of kids to save for retirement; have a tax cut but don't let it interfere with our obligation to invest in our children's education, to save Medicare and Social Security and get us out of debt."

What's their side? They can say it better. Their side is, "Hey, it's your money. We've got it. It's a surplus. We want to give it back to you. That's the problem with the Democrats. They never saw a program they didn't like. It's your money. We're going to give it back to you." And they propose to spend, at least from the taxes they passed in the last 12 months to the one that their candidate for President is advocating and is in the Republican platform, over \$2 trillion in tax cuts over the next 10 years. And they say, "Well, so what? We're supposed to have a surplus of \$2 trillion." Now, never mind the fact that that, number one, gives them no money for their own spending promises.

Did you ever get one of those letters in the mail from Publishers' Clearinghouse, Ed McMahon? You may have won \$10 million. Did you go out and spend the \$10 million the next day? If you did, you should support the Republicans this year. *[Laughter]* If not,

you'd better stick with us. You better stick with us.

Folks, that money is not there yet. That money is not there yet. If we invest this year in education and we say we want to spend this much next year and the money doesn't come in, we don't have to spend it. But once you cut taxes, it's gone, and it's pretty hard to get a bunch of politicians to come back in and raise them again because the money didn't materialize. So you've got to tell people that.

Look at your friends and say, "Listen, if I ask you to sign a contract right now, committing to spend every penny of your projected income over the next 10 years, would you do it? If you would, you should support them. If not, you'd better stick with us. Keep this economy going."

I got an economic analysis last week from a professional economist that said that Vice President Gore's economic plan would keep interest rates at least one percent lower—at least one percent lower—than his opponent's plan over the next decade. Do you know what that's worth?—\$250 billion in home mortgage savings, \$30 billion in car payment savings, \$15 billion in student loan payments. That's a pretty good size tax cut, and besides, you get a health economy, and you get America out of debt. It's a huge difference. People don't know it. It's up to you to make sure they do.

Let me just take one or two others. In health care, we want to lengthen the life of Medicare and Social Security. We want to add a Medicare drug benefit that all of our seniors can afford. We want a Patients' Bill of Rights. On those three issues they say, "No, no, no. No lengthening the life of Medicare and Social Security." Indeed, one of the tax cuts they passed this week would take 5 years off the life of Medicare. "No Patients' Bill of Rights with the right to be vindicated if you get hurt. No Medicare drug benefit that all of our seniors can afford who need it."

On crime, we say, "Put more police out there, and do more to take guns out of the hands of criminals and kids. Specifically, close the gun show loophole; mandate child trigger locks; don't import large-capacity ammunition clips to get around the assault

weapons ban.” And the Vice President says—and I agree with him—“Make people who buy handguns get a photo ID license like people who buy cars, showing that they passed a background check and they know how to use the gun safely.”

They say “No, no, no, no. Instead, have more people carrying concealed weapons—in church, if necessary.” [Laughter] That’s their record and their position. Now, that’s a clear choice. People don’t know that. Did you see that survey last week of suburban women voters who care a lot about this issue? And they had no idea what the differences were.

Now, the chief political argument is that the head of the NRA said they’d have an office in the White House if the Republicans win. But what I want to tell you is something more profound. They won’t need an office in the White House because they’ll do what they want to anyway, because that’s what they believe.

Look, I think we have got a chance here to get away from this politics of personal destruction. We should say that our opponents are honorable, good, decent, patriotic people, and we have honest disagreements with them. The only thing we disagree with is, they’re trying to hide the disagreements. So let’s tell the American people what the differences are and let them decide. And whatever they decide, we can all go on about our business and be happy with our lives because democracy is working. But we can’t if they don’t know.

Let’s look at the environment. We say we should have higher standards for the environment and deal with the problems of climate change, and we can improve the environment and the economy at the same time. And they don’t believe that, basically. And one of the specific commitments made by their candidate in the primary—something they hope all you forget; they hope you have selective amnesia about the Republican primary—but one of the specific commitments made was to reverse my order establishing 43 million acres that are roadless in our national forests, something the Audobon Society said was the most significant conservation move in the last 40 years. Now, they’re on record committing to repeal that.

So there’s a difference there. People need to know what the differences are, and if they agree with them, they should vote for them. If they agree with us, they can vote for us. But they ought to know.

I’ll give you a couple other examples. Hate crimes legislation: We’re for it; their leadership is opposed to it because it also protects gays. Employment nondiscrimination legislation: We’re for it; they’re against it. Raising the minimum wage: We’re for it; they’re against it. More vigorous civil rights enforcement and involvement: We’re for it; they’re against it.

Now, all the big publicity is about, in the last few days, an amazing vote cast by their nominee for Vice President when he was in Congress against letting Nelson Mandela out of jail. And that takes your breath away. But Mr. Mandela got out of jail in spite of that congressional vote. Most of the Congressmen voted to let him out. He became President of South Africa, and the rest is history.

I’m worried about the people now whom I’ve tried to put on the Court of Appeals who are African-American and Hispanic, who are being held in political jail because they can’t get a hearing from this Republican Senate, and their nominee won’t say a word about it—never.

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in the southeastern part of the United States has never had an African-American, but it has more African-American citizens than any other one. I’ve been trying for 7 long years to fix it, and they’ve blocked every one. They are so determined to keep an African-American off the court that they have allowed a 25 percent vacancy rate on the fourth circuit—just to keep an African-American off the court.

There are two now I’ve got up there. They could prove me wrong. Give them a hearing, and confirm them. In Texas, I nominated a man named Enrique Moreno from El Paso that the Texas State trial judges said was one of the best lawyers in west Texas, a guy that graduated at the top of his class at Harvard, came out of El Paso and did that. He got the highest rating from the ABA. And the Texas Republican Senators said he wasn’t

qualified. And by their likes, he's not qualified because he's not a guaranteed ideological purist vote.

And the leader of the Republican Party in Texas, now the leader of the American Republican Party, all he had to do was say, "Give this man a hearing. This is wrong." But not a peep. So let's worry more about Moreno—Mandela took care of himself just fine—and the people in the fourth circuit and the other people. This is a big issue.

Now, I'm sure they have principled reasons. They really want somebody on the Court of Appeals. They think it would be a better country if people toed the ideological line. I have appointed the most diverse and the highest rated group of judges in the last 40 years, and I didn't ask them what their party lines were.

Now, that leads me to the last point. I think the last place where there is a clear choice is, choice and civil rights enforcement and the civil justice system. The next President will make two to four appointments to the Supreme Court, almost certainly. The Vice President has said where he stands on this. Their nominees are both avowed opponents of *Roe v. Wade*, and their nominee for President said the people he admired most in the Supreme Court were Justices Thomas and Scalia, those that are the most conservative.

Now, I'll bet you anything nobody gets up and gives a speech about this in Philadelphia. But it's a relevant thing. It will change the shape of America far beyond the lifetime of the next Presidency.

So I say to you—and I'm not attacking them personally. These are differences. And I don't even blame them for trying to hide the differences because they know if the folks find out, they're toast. [Laughter] I don't blame them. But I have worked so hard to turn this country around. I have done all I could do. And I don't want my country to squander the opportunity of a lifetime, the opportunity of a generation to build the future of our dreams for our children. That's what I want.

And I think what's best for America is Al Gore. That's what I really believe. That's what I believe. He's done more good in the office of Vice President than anybody who

ever held it. We've had some great Presidents who were Vice President. None of them did remotely as much for America as Vice President as he has, from casting the tie-breaking vote on the budget to casting the tie-breaking vote for gun safety in this year; from managing our downsizing of the Government to the smallest size in 40 years to making sure that we pass an E-rate in the Telecommunications Act that can make sure all the poor schools in this country could hook up to the Internet; from managing a lot of our environmental programs to managing a lot of our foreign policy with Russia, Egypt, and other countries.

There has never been anybody who has had remotely as much influence as Vice President as he has. And therefore, he is, by definition then, the best qualified person in our lifetime to be President.

The second thing you need to know is, there is a big difference in economic policy. I've already said that, but if you want this thing to go on—everybody who wants to live like a Republican needs to vote Democrat this year. [Laughter] Now, if you want it to go on, you've got to do it.

And the third thing that you need to know about him is he understands the future. He understood the potential of the Internet to carry the Library of Congress when it was the private province of Defense Department physicists. Don't you want somebody like that in the White House when we have to decide who gets a hold of your medical and financial records that are on the Internet?

He understands the potential of the human genome project and this whole biomedical revolution. Don't you want someone like that in the White House when we have to decide whether someone can deny you a job or a promotion or health insurance based on your gene map?

He understands climate change. People made fun of him 12 years ago. When we ran together in '92, they made fun of him. Now the oil companies acknowledge that climate change and global warming are real, and it's going to change the whole way our children live unless we deal with it. Wouldn't you like

someone in the White House that really understands that? You need somebody that understands the future. It's going to be here before you know it.

And the last thing I'll say—it's what you already know or you wouldn't be here—this is the most diverse, interesting country we've ever had. We're going out into a world that's more and more interdependent, where we have obligations to people around the world that we must fulfill if we want to do well ourselves. And I want someone in the White House that will take us all along for the ride, and he will.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:30 p.m. at the 437 Rush Restaurant. In his remarks, he referred to Richard H. Middleton, Jr., president, Fred Baron, president-elect, Leo Boyle, vice president, and Anthony Tarricone, member, board of governors, Association of Trial Lawyers of America; U.S. senatorial candidates Deborah Senn of Washington, Ed Bernstein of Nevada, and Brian Schweitzer of Montana; Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush of Texas and Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney; and Wayne LaPierre, executive vice president, National Rifle Association.

### **Remarks to the Association of Trial Lawyers of America in Chicago** *July 30, 2000*

President Middleton, after your remarks, if I had any sense, I wouldn't say anything. I'd just sit down. [*Laughter*] I want to thank you, and thank you, Fred Baron, my longtime friend, for inviting me here. There are so many of you here that I've had the honor of working with over the last 7½ years, sometimes even longer.

I am proud of the fact that this organization and its members have been standing up for the rights of wronged and injured Americans since 1946. Now, that was before we had the EPA or the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or the Clean Air or Clean Water Act. It's important to remember that those protections and many others were written into the law after years of lawsuits that highlighted the problems we faced and wrongs that were done.

What is the lesson of all this? That the public interest requires both reasonable access to the courts and responsible action by Congress. We have done what we could in the last 7½ years to move toward accountability in the courts on three issues—tobacco, guns, and patients' rights—and to keep the American people's availability of a civil justice system alive and well.

But only Congress can pass laws that will hold tobacco companies, gun manufacturers, and health plans accountable for the choices they make and the consequences of those choices. So I hope Congress will also help us because I know that everybody in this room agrees that an ounce of prevention in law is worth a million dollars in curative lawsuits.

We've worked for 7½ years now to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco, thanks in large measure to the leadership of Vice President Gore, and Senator Dick Durbin from Illinois, who has been with me through much of this day. Now the Justice Department is leading our efforts to get tobacco companies to repay the Government for the costs of tobacco-related illnesses. But the Supreme Court has told Congress the ball is in its court. It must act to give FDA tobacco regulations the force of law.

I have asked Congress to do that and to support, not undermine, the Justice Department's lawsuit. I hope that the Congress, and especially the Republicans in Congress, will be able to break an addiction to the tobacco lobby and meet their responsibilities to the American people.

I am grateful beyond measure that the crime rate has dropped in this country to a 25-year low, that gun crime is down by 35 percent over the last 7½ years, but I don't think anybody in America believes that we're safe enough as a nation or that there's not more we can do—more we can do to put more police on the street in dangerous neighborhoods; more we can do to keep our kids off the streets in after-school programs, summer school programs, summer job programs, mentoring programs; and more we can do to keep guns out the hands of criminals and children.

I've asked Congress to give us common-sense gun legislation, measures to close the

gun show loophole and the Brady background check law, to require child safety locks for all handguns, to ban the importation of large capacity ammunition clips. I've also endorsed requiring people who buy handguns to get a photo ID license, just like a driver's license, showing that you passed the background check and you know how to use the gun safely. So far, no action in Congress, even on the first three measures.

We reached a historic agreement with the Smith & Wesson company to build safer guns, a truly astonishing step forward and a brave thing for them to do. But the rest of the industry and the gun lobby are trying to destroy them for doing it, and they're working hard to make sure that they can't keep up their end of the bargain.

I hope all of them will think again about where their responsibility really lies. After all, who honestly has an interest in selling a gun to somebody with a criminal record? Who has an interest in selling a gun that's not protected when it will be put in some place where a little child can find it and cause an accidental death? I hope that we'll see a change in attitude there, too, and I hope the American people will have the opportunity to make their position on these matters crystal clear in November.

Wherever I go, I heard heartbreaking stories about patients turned away from the closest emergency room. The other day I was in Missouri with the Governor of that State who signed one of the strongest patients' bill of rights in the country at the State level, and they still have about a million people in their State who aren't covered because of the way the Federal law works.

And there was this emergency room nurse speaking with us there—or it was an emergency nurse who had been also an emergency medical technician. It was a man who must have weighed 225 pounds and looked like he could bench-press me on a cold day. And this big old burly guy got up and practically started crying, talking about someone that he had just seen die because they were not permitted to go to the nearest emergency room.

I had a guy the other day tell me a story about getting hit by a car and saying that this health plan wouldn't approve his going to the nearest emergency room because he

hadn't called for permission first. He said, "I was unconscious at the time. I didn't know how to make the phone call." [Laughter]

Now, all of you know these are—if you practice in this area, you know that this is not just some set of isolated anecdotes. And I believe that health care decisions should be made by health care professionals. I believe people ought to be able to go to the nearest emergency room. I don't believe that people should be forced to change physicians in the middle of a treatment, whether it's chemotherapy or having a baby. And I think if people get hurt, they ought to have the right to seek redress in our courts. That's what the Patients' Bill of Rights does.

Let me say, as I have said over and over again, this is not a partisan issue. Survey after survey after survey has shown that more than 70 percent of the American people, whether they identify themselves as Republicans or Democrats or independents, support the passage of a strong, enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights. This is not a partisan issue. This is a special interest issue.

We passed with a bipartisan vote—a good number of Republicans voted for a bill called the Norwood-Dingel bill in the House of Representatives, and I am profoundly grateful to everyone who voted for that bill in both parties. And then, in the Senate, we came within a vote, really, of passing it. We lost it 51–49, and if it had gotten 50 votes, then the Vice President could have broken the tie. And as he never tires of saying, whenever he votes, we win. [Laughter] He always kids me that he has a much better record of legislative success than I do. He never loses. Whenever he votes, we win.

And so I have some hope that we can do this. But this is a huge deal, and it goes to the core of what kind of people we are. And I feel that I have the right to speak passionately about this because I actually have always supported managed care in general. Let me remind you of something.

Your president was telling you about what things were like in 1992. In 1992, and for several years before that, health care costs had been going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We were then and are now spending about 4 percent more of our national income, which is a huge chunk of change, on health



care than any other country in the world; about 6 percent more than virtually all other advanced countries—Canada is 4 percent lower than we are—and yet we were the only one that basically had tens of millions of people without any health insurance.

So it was obvious that we needed to manage the system better because a lot of the money was just getting away from us. Having said that, you cannot allow the management of the system to overcome its fundamental purpose, which is to help people get healthy or stay healthy or deal with them when they're injured or sick.

Let me just emphasize, I've talked to a lot of people about this. I've talked to a lot of nurses and doctors and people who work in insurance companies. I've talked to the 14 representatives of the 14 HMO's that endorsed our Patients' Bill of Rights, because they desperately want to do this, but they don't want to be disadvantaged by having all their competitors able to run off and leave them and follow a different set of rules.

And the fundamental problem is, in a lot of these cases, particularly on specialist care, is that you have to go through three levels before a final decision is made, and the people at the first two levels know they'll never get in trouble for saying no. And whenever you have a system where someone never gets in trouble for saying no and not get in trouble for saying yes, even if yes is plainly the right answer, then there needs to be some way people can get redress if they get hurt in a system like that. That's the issue. So a right without a remedy is just a suggestion. And I think we all know that.

So we've got to keep working. We might get there this year. We're chipping away at it. If we turn one or maybe two to be safe in the Senate, we'll be home.

Now, let me just say one other thing. I couldn't appear before an audience of lawyers without mentioning what I consider to be another threat to our system of equal justice under law, and that is the Senate's slowdown in consideration and confirmation of my nominees to our courts, especially to our appellate courts.

The judges I have appointed have the highest ratings the American Bar Association has given out in 40 years. They are also the

most diverse group ever appointed to the Federal bench. We've shattered the myth that diversity and quality don't go hand in hand.

I also have bent over backwards not to appoint people just because I thought that every single ruling would agree with me. And I've probably appointed a person or two that some of you didn't like. But I've tried to find mainstream judges that would follow the Constitution and be faithful to the interest of individual litigants who have rights under the law and Constitution of the United States and to be fair and balanced to both sides. That's what I have tried to do.

Now, it is, therefore—because of that record, and there have been lots of legal analyses by respected, totally nonpolitical writers saying how I have changed the thrust of the court appointments, especially appellate court appointments, and my appointees are far less ideological, one way or the other, than those of the last two administrations. Now, a blue ribbon panel, however, recently found that during the 105th Congress, the nominations of women and minorities tended to take 2 months—2 months—longer to be considered than those of white males, and though they were just as qualified, according to the ABA, they tended to be rejected twice as often. I'll give you just exhibit A. I've talked about this all over America.

I nominated a man named Enrique Moreno, a highly regarded trial lawyer from El Paso, to the fifth circuit. The Texas State judges said he was one of the three best trial lawyers in the region. The ABA unanimously rated him well-qualified. He had broad support from local law enforcement officials and from local Republicans and Democrats. Again, it was not a partisan issue. The guy came up out of El Paso, went to Harvard, made great grades, made something of himself. Everybody said he was qualified—everybody except the two Senators from Texas who said he wasn't qualified, no matter what the ABA said, no matter what the Texas State judges said, no matter what the local Republicans and Democrats said; he's not qualified. Nineteen years in practice isn't enough to qualify to make the kind of judgments they have to make. And regrettably, none of the other leading Republicans in Texas would

even ask for him to have a hearing. And so he sits in limbo.

Look at the fourth circuit in the southeast United States. The largest percentage of African-Americans in any Federal circuit are in the fourth circuit; 25 percent of the judge-ships are vacant. I've been trying for 7 years to put an African-American on that court because there has never been one in the district with the largest number of African-Americans in the entire country. I think it's wrong. And they have worked so hard to keep me from doing it that they're willing to tolerate a 25 percent vacancy rate.

Now, keep in mind I never sent anybody up there that wasn't qualified. We now have two fine, well-qualified African-Americans pending for that circuit, Judge James Wynn of North Carolina and Roger Gregory of Virginia. Neither has even gotten a hearing.

The Senate has 37 nominations before it now, and 29 of those folks have never gotten a hearing. Fifteen have been nominated to fill empty seats that the U.S. courts consider judicial emergencies, places where our legal business simply isn't being done; 13 of them, including well-respected litigators like Dolly Gee and first-rate jurists like Lagrome Davis, have been waiting more than a year. Judge Helene White has been waiting for 3 years.

Now, if we want our courts to function properly, the Senate ought to vote these folks up or down. If they don't like them, vote them down. But is the question, can they be competent; will they run a fair and effective court if there are criminal trials; will the civil cases be tried promptly and fairly; do they believe justice delayed is justice denied; or is the problem that they are not sufficiently ideologically predictable?

This is a big issue and a serious precedent. We all want justice to be blind, but we know when we have diversity in our courts, just as in other aspects of our society, it sharpens our vision and makes us a stronger nation. That is a goal ATLA has always set.

Now, I was told that no President had ever addressed the full ATLA convention before, and since you were born in the same year I was, I thought I'd show up. [*Laughter*] I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the kindness so many of you have shown me, the support that so many of you have given

to our initiatives, to defending the civil courts and defending the Constitution. This is a year in which the American people will be given a chance to chart the course of the future for a long time to come. They'll elect a new President, a new Vice President, Senators, and Members of Congress. In the course of that, if all the predictions are true, they will also be shaping a new Supreme Court because the next President, in all probability, will make between two and four appointments to the Supreme Court. Choices will be made and those choices will have consequences.

I think it is very important that you make up your mind what you think the choices are and what the consequences will be, and that you share them with others. The last time a President, nearly as I can tell from my research, talked to any ATLA group was when President Johnson appeared before your board of directors in 1964. And so I want to tell you a little story about 1964 to emphasize why I think this year is so important to all of us as Americans.

In 1964 I graduated from high school, and I, therefore, have a very clear recollection of that year. All of us were still profoundly sad over the death of President Kennedy, but fundamentally optimistic. America was then in the full flow of what was until now the longest economic expansion in history. Vietnam had not yet blown up, and no one really thought it would get as big as it did or claim as many lives as it did or divide the country the way it did.

There were—then we had about 10 years of vigorous activism in civil rights, but most people believed, given the White House and the composition of the Congress, that the civil rights problems of this country would be solved in the Congress and in the courts, not in the streets. And nearly everybody thought the economy was on automatic, and you couldn't mess it up if you tried. We took low unemployment and high growth and low inflation for granted. And I was one of those bright-eyed idealistic kids that felt just that way.

Two years later we had riots in the streets. Four years later, when I graduated from Georgetown, it was 9 weeks after President Johnson said he couldn't run for President

again because the country was so divided over Vietnam, 8 weeks after Martin Luther King was killed in Memphis, 2 days after Senator Kennedy was killed in Los Angeles. The next election had a different outcome. Within a few months, the previous longest economic expansion in history itself was history.

What's the point of all this? I don't know when we'll ever have a time like this again, where we have so much economic prosperity and all the social indicators from crime to welfare to teen pregnancy, you name it, they're all going in the right direction; where our country is in a position to be a force for peace and freedom and decency from the Middle East to Northern Ireland to the Balkans to Africa and Latin America; where we have the chance to build the future of our dreams for our children and protect the fundamental essence of American citizenship and constitutional liberty, even as we build a more united community amidst all of our diversity.

And I'm old enough now to know that nothing stays the same, and things change. And I say this to you more as a citizen than as a President, because I'm not a candidate this year. But I think it is profoundly important that the American people make up their mind what to do with this moment—this magic moment in our history. And I think we will not ever forgive ourselves if we let it get away from us.

In 1964, when LBJ came here, we let it get away from us. But the problems were deep and imponderable and difficult to move away from—the problem of Vietnam and the problem of civil rights. We are not burdened to the extent that time was by anything of that magnitude. But we know what's coming down the pike. We know we have to deal with the retirement of the baby boomers. We know we're not giving every kid in this country a world-class education. We know that we have not done what we should do in terms of safe streets and health care. We know we're going to have to deal with the problems of climate change. We know this explosion in biotechnology that the human genome project exemplifies will change things forever and require us to rethink our whole notion of health and retirement. We know that we

have responsibilities to people around the world if we want Americans to do as well as they can at home.

And at the core of it all is, what is our fundamental notion about what it means to be a citizen of this country, to have rights in the courts and on the streets and in our daily lives?—yes, but also to have responsibilities to one another and to our country and to the future.

I want you all to think about that. I've done everything I knew to turn this country around, to try to get things going in the right direction. And now all the great stuff is still out there just waiting for us to build a future of our dreams for our kids. That's all that matters, not the politics, not the injuries, not the hurts, not the barbs, not the bragging, not the plaudits.

There's an old Italian proverb that says, "After the game, the king and the pawn go back into the same box." It's well to remember. All we really have is our common humanity. But once in a great long while, we get an unbelievable opportunity to make the most of it. You've got it now, and I hope you will.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:25 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Richard H. Middleton, Jr., president, and Fred Baron, president-elect, Association of Trial Lawyers of America; and Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri.

## **Statement on the Gun Buyback Initiative**

*July 30, 2000*

I am pleased that Secretary Cuomo and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) are moving forward with their successful gun buyback initiative. By teaming up law enforcement, local authorities, and citizens in the fight to reduce gun violence, the HUD gun buyback program has already helped remove over 17,000 guns from our communities. Today's announcement that BuyBack America will continue will ensure the removal of thousands more guns, preventing an untold number of gun accidents, suicides, and crimes. Despite

HUD's clear authority to carry out this important program, the gun lobby and other opponents of commonsense gun safety measures continue to challenge this initiative. We remain committed to carrying out BuyBack America, and I call on HUD to continue to offer this vital assistance to communities seeking our support in addressing their local gun violence problems.

HUD's gun buybacks are an important part of my administration's comprehensive strategy to reduce gun violence in America. While we are making progress in this fight, gun violence remains far too high. Congress can do its part by finally passing the stalled commonsense gun safety legislation to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and children and fully funding my \$280 million gun enforcement initiative to crack down on gun criminals. Congress should put the public safety interests of American families above those of the gun lobby and support these efforts instead of working to undermine them. If we work together, we can continue to bring down gun crime, reduce gun violence, and save lives.

### **Remarks on Permanent Normal Trade Relations With China in Tampa, Florida**

*July 31, 2000*

Thank you very much. First of all, let me say that I'm delighted to be back in Florida. I'm glad to be here with Jim Davis and my longtime friends Bill Nelson and Buddy MacKay, who is doing a wonderful job for the United States as our Special Envoy to the Americas. And he did spearhead the passage in the Congress earlier this year the Caribbean Basin trade initiative, which is one of the most important things Congress has done this year. It is something I know that will be of special benefit to Florida.

I want to just say a few words about this China issue. First of all, it is part of an overall strategy we have followed for almost 8 years now. When I became President, it was obvious to me that to turn the economy around, we had to do three things: we had to get rid of the deficit and get interest rates down and get investments up; we had to invest in

the new technologies of the future and in the educational capacity of our people and to create a whole network of lifetime learning in America; and we had to expand trade.

Whether we like it or not, the economy of every country will become increasingly global, and we have to be in a position to take advantage of it. A lot of people who don't agree with my position say that, well, we've still got a big trade deficit. That's true. And the reason we do is because our economy has grown so much more rapidly than that of our major trading partners. A 5-year economic slowdown in Japan has contributed to our trade deficit. The collapse of the other Asian economies for a couple of years and the problems that Russia had all contributed to our trade deficit.

But if you look to the long-term future, America has got—if we want to make things, we've got to sell them to somebody. We have 4 percent of the world's population and 22 percent of the world's income. So it's not rocket science to figure out that if you're going to produce this much wealth, you've got to sell it to somebody.

And so I believe that—we have now about 300 trade agreements we've negotiated over 8 years under the leadership of Charlene Barshefsky and, before her, Mickey Kantor. I think they've done a great job, and as I said, Buddy MacKay has done a great job. We have enjoyed strong support in a bipartisan fashion from the Florida legislative delegation, and Senator Graham in particular has been very helpful, and I'm grateful for that.

But this China issue is something special because it involves huge economics, but it goes beyond economics. And I'd just like to mention and make one or two points here. The agreement basically is not like other trade agreements. In all the other trade agreements, they really are trade—we get together, and we swap out. You give them something. They give you something, and you work out the best deal you possibly can. And not everybody's happy, but you do it because you think there will be more good than harm.

This is really a membership agreement, and it's important that it be understood as that. That is, in order for China to get into

the WTO, the members of the World Trading Organization have to agree that China will get in on reasonable commercial terms. So in order to do that, they have to start with the world's largest economy, the United States, and we work out what the reasonable terms would be.

Since we have a very large trade deficit with China, which is typical for a country that's developing like that, their markets are more closed to us than our markets are to them. This agreement essentially involves opening China's markets for trade and for investment to an extent that would have been unimaginable even a year or a year-and-a-half ago. Phosphate fertilizer will be affected; citrus will be affected; automobiles and automobile parts and dealerships will be affected. It's all, in that sense, a one-way street in our favor.

Now, China will also be able to sell more things to us as it grows more economically diverse and more powerful. So it's a good deal for them because they can modernize their economy.

Beyond that, I have to tell you that, for me, while keeping this prosperity going is very important, and in some ways, and the great underlying issue that the American people have to decide in this election year, and I think a big part of it is paying off the debt, for example—we can be out of debt in 12 years. And if we do it, interest rates over the next decade will be at least a point lower than they otherwise would be, and that's lower business loans, \$250 billion in lower home mortgage payments, \$30 billion in car payments, \$15 billion in college loan payments. I think that's very important. But this trade issue must be at the heart of that.

Beyond that, as important as all the economics is, you should understand also that this is a big national security issue for the United States. In the last 50, 60 years, we fought three wars with Asia. A lot of blood was shed in World War II and Korea and Vietnam. Now we look to the future, and we don't know what the next 50 years will hold. And no one can guarantee the future, but we know this, that if we're trading with people and working with them, there's a lot better chance that we will find peaceful ways to work out whatever differences we have.

And the more China is involved in the global economy, the global society, the more likely it is to change and become more democratic, to become more open, to become more transparent, and to become a better partner instead of a competitor with us in the Pacific region, and a better neighbor to all the other countries in that area.

So I really believe that there are lives at stake here. I believe our futures' at stake. And I believe if we can—if you look at the two largest countries in the world in population, they are China and India. And the Indian subcontinent together actually has about the same population as China. And if we could affect a peaceful transition in both those places that have greater trade at its core and greater communications back and forth, the world would be a very different place in the next 50 years and a much better place for all of our children.

So I want to tell you all, although I know your interest, properly, is in the benefits that will flow directly to your activities in this State and in this region, the truth is it's bigger than all that. And it's about what kind of future our kids and our grandkids are going to have.

I just want to make one last point, a very practical one. Jim Davis was appropriately modest, but the truth is we had to fight like the devil to get things in the House. And we carried—and we had a pretty good vote, as it turned out. But it was a very, very hard fight. And it was a harder fight for members of our party. And he showed great courage and great leadership, and you should be very grateful to him because he really stuck it out there. He was very strong, unambiguous, saying we should do this, and it's the right thing for our country. And I'm really proud of him for doing it.

Here's the practical issue. We got this bill through the House in a timely fashion. I had very much hoped that we would pass it through the Senate, where it's an easier bill to pass. We've got way more votes than we need to pass it. But we couldn't get it through all the procedural and substantive business of the Senate before the Fourth of July and then before the August recess. That means that we have to pass it early in September, as soon as they come back, after both parties

have their conventions and the August recess is over.

We had a very encouraging vote on procedure that got over 80 votes in the Senate, basically to take it up early. But it is absolutely imperative that this bill be voted in early September. The longer they take to vote on it, the more likely it could be caught up in procedural wrangling in the Senate. The people who are against the bill, and there are people in both parties that are against the bill, interestingly, though they tend to be, ironically, the most conservative members of the Republican caucus and the most liberal members of the Democratic caucus.

But the Senate is set up—the Senate is set up and was set up by the Founders to slow things down. And one Member can cause a world of trouble if there are a whole lot of other things going on at the same time. So this is not a done deal. We had 60 people who—I think there are probably 70 Senators for this. And I know that it may be hard for you to imagine that if that's the case that we would have some trouble bringing this up in early September. But in fact, it is true.

I am very grateful to Senator Lott, the Republican leader in the Senate, the majority leader, for his amendment to bring this up in early September. This is really an American issue. This should not be a partisan issue. It is a very important economic and a national security issue.

But one of the things that I hope to come out at this meeting is that either as an organization or individually, you will make it clear both to your Senators, Senator Mack and Senator Graham, but also insofar as you can to the Senate hierarchy, that it is imperative that this be brought up early. The Senate—the Democratic leader, Senator Daschle, is also strongly in support of what we're doing.

But the only worry I have now is that with all the business they still have to do, with all the budgetary issues, and the controversy that inevitably attends the closing weeks of a congressional session in an election year, something procedural could happen that would delay this, and you just don't know what's going to happen. And I can tell you that it is profoundly important to our country.

So anything you can do to make your voices heard as ordinary Americans on behalf of voting this quickly in September, that's the key. If they vote it early in September, it will pass quick, and we will have a better future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:07 a.m. at the Airport Hilton. In his remarks, he referred to Bill Nelson, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate from Florida; and former U.S. Trade Representative Michael (Mickey) Kantor. The President's remarks were part of the "China: Florida's New Market of Opportunity" program. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

### **Remarks at the David Barksdale Senior Center in Tampa**

*July 31, 2000*

Thank you very much. Well, Sylvia made a better speech than I can for this program. [*Laughter*] Let's give her another hand. Didn't she do a great job? [*Applause*]

Paul Herrera, thank you and the Barksdale Senior Golden Age Club for welcoming me here. I'm delighted to be here. And thank all of you for coming out.

I want to thank Bill Nelson, your insurance commissioner, for joining me here and for the work he's done to protect Florida seniors from insurance fraud, and also the work he's done to help enroll children in the Children's Health Insurance Program. I thank him for that.

Mayor Greco, it's good to be back in your great city. I love it here. I'd also like to acknowledge the presence in the audience of your former Lieutenant Governor, now our Special Envoy to Latin America, Buddy MacKay. Thank you for being here.

This center was founded in 1942. It was then a place where Army and Air Force personnel could enjoy it during off-duty hours. While the uses of the Barksdale Center have changed over the years, the purpose hasn't. It still serves those who served our Nation, in uniform and in so many other ways. As Paul Herrera has said, the Barksdale Center has become a second home for many of Tampa's seniors and disabled citizens, a place to take music classes, to learn the two-step—

maybe I'm not too old to learn that—to get a nutritious meal, and a bedrock of security, a place you can all rely on in good times and bad. I appreciate the work that is done here.

For our Nation, these are good times, remarkably good times, virtually without precedent in the history of America. Like the rest of America, Florida is on the move. When I came to Tampa as a candidate in 1992, the unemployment rate was over 7 percent; today, it's 2.7 percent. The Nation has created over 22 million jobs, with the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, the longest economic expansion in history, with record deficits turned into record surpluses.

The question before the American people, as the Congress deliberates and as the voters deliberate, is, what are we going to do with this magic moment of prosperity? What is the best use of it? Will we think about short-term gains or will we think about what we should do for our country over the long run for people of all ages, all races, and all backgrounds and all income groups. I believe one of the most important things we can do with our prosperity is to strengthen Medicare by adding a prescription drug benefit.

Thirty-five years ago, when President Johnson signed Medicare into law, he created a cornerstone upon which generations of Americans could safely rest. Since then, Medicare has been a remarkable success and a solid guarantee. Before Medicare, more than half of our seniors had no health care coverage at all. Serious illness often wiped away in an instant all the savings families had put away over a lifetime of hard work.

Today, nearly every senior has the security of basic health coverage. Poverty among elderly has fallen dramatically as a result, and Americans over 65 have the highest life expectancy of all the world's seniors. Any American who lives to be 65 today has a life expectancy in excess of 82 years. People over 80 are the fastest growing group of people in America in percentage terms. I hope to be one of them one of these days. *[Laughter]* Yet, for all its success, as Bill Nelson made clear, Medicare simply has not kept pace with the growing miracles of modern medicine.

The Medicare law was created at a time when patients' lives were more often saved

by a surgeon's scalpel than by pharmaceuticals, when many of the lifesaving drugs we now take for granted did not even exist, indeed, were not even thought of. Prescription drugs today can accomplish what once was done through expensive surgery, and no one—if we were creating the Medicare program today, starting from scratch, it would not even occur to anyone to create a Medicare program without a prescription drug benefit.

Adding a voluntary prescription drug benefit is the right thing to do, but it's also, medically, the smart thing to do. Today, fully half of Medicare beneficiaries don't have prescription drug coverage for part or all of the year. And the cost of prescription drugs is taking too big a bite out of the fixed incomes of too many seniors and people with disabilities. You heard that today in the remarks that were made before I came up here, in ways more eloquent than I could possibly express.

Sylvia's story, however, is not unique to her. I'll bet it's repeated among a lot of you in this audience, and I can promise you all across America, there are millions and millions and millions just like her. Too many people literally are forced to choose on a weekly basis between filling their prescriptions and filling their grocery carts.

A Family USA report released today shows that the cost of prescription drugs is continuing to increase. According to this report, older Americans now pay an average of more than \$1,200 a year for prescription drugs, up from \$559 in 1992. The amount is projected to increase to more than—listen to this—\$2,800 over the next decade. Here in Florida, hundreds of thousands of seniors lack the benefits of dependable prescription drug coverage. Thousands of others try to get coverage through private Medigap insurance plans and managed care. Some have succeeded only to be dropped later by their private care plans and left with nothing more than an empty medicine chest.

In fact, just this year, nearly a million Medicare beneficiaries around America, more than 85,000 in Florida alone, were dropped by their managed care plans. For most seniors, that leaves only one alternative to drug coverage: They can buy into a private

Medigap plan, which can cost hundreds of dollars a month for a benefit with a \$250 deductible and no protections against catastrophic drug costs.

Now, most of us tend to think of Medicare beneficiaries as seniors, but in fact, 5 million of them are people with disabilities under the age of 65. A quarter million of them live right here in Florida, too. As difficult as it is for seniors to get affordable and dependable prescription drugs, it's an even greater challenge for Americans with disabilities.

Today I'm releasing another report that documents how Medicare beneficiaries with disabilities are in poor health, require more prescriptions, and are less likely to have private prescription drug coverage. The report also shows that people with disabilities purchased 40 percent more drugs than the typical Medicare beneficiary. And like seniors who lack drug coverage, they, too, pay more for the drugs they do get.

On average, Medicare beneficiaries with disabilities who lack coverage spend 50 percent more out of pocket for 50 percent fewer prescriptions than those who have coverage. Let me say that again. People without coverage spend 50 percent more out of pocket for 50 percent fewer prescriptions than those who have coverage. These drugs aren't only lifesaving; they can help people with disabilities return to work and make even greater contributions to their communities, people like Patricia Fell, over here to my right who came up with me on the stage, from Clearwater. She suffers every day from a very painful hip condition. She has been a foster mother—listen to this—to 87 children. And her daughter is here with us today, and we welcome her.

She uses her disability check to pay her \$4,300 annual prescription drug bill. She would work full-time, but if she did, she'd lose her disability check. That's what pays for the prescription drugs she desperately needs. She told me that this is continuing to be an agonizing choice for her.

Now, people like her, who have done their part for our country and done way more than most people have to help children in need, shouldn't have to make a choice between health and work. A Medicare drug benefit would give Pat the chance to be as healthy,

active, and productive as she could possibly be.

That's why I have proposed a plan to provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit that is voluntary and accessible to all seniors and all Americans with disabilities; a plan that ensures that all older Americans and other eligible Americans with disabilities, no matter where they live or how sick they are, will pay the same affordable \$25 a month premium; a plan that uses price competition, not price controls, to give seniors and people with disabilities the best price as possible; a plan that would cover catastrophic drug costs; a plan that provides beneficiaries the prescriptions they need at the pharmacies they trust; a plan that is part of an overall effort to strengthen and modernize Medicare and lengthen its life so that we will not have to ask our children to shoulder the burden of the baby boom generation when we retire.

Now, in response, the Republican majority in Congress has passed a private insurance plan that many seniors and people with disabilities simply will not be able to afford. You see that already with the Medigap plan. It won't offer affordable and accessible coverage to all seniors. It relies on a trickle-down scheme that provides a subsidy for insurers but not a single dollar for middle class seniors and people with disabilities. And let me say this: Over half the seniors and people with disabilities who lack affordable insurance coverage today have incomes above 150 percent of the poverty line, which is about \$12,600 for an individual senior, about \$16,600 for a couple.

Now, I'm President; I'm not supposed to say it's a bunch of baloney, like Sylvia did. [Laughter] But you might be surprised to know who agrees with her—the insurance companies, themselves. Even the insurance companies concede that a Medigap insurance model will not work for prescription drug coverage. This is very, very important.

Here's what one insurance company had to say, and I quote, "Private, stand-alone prescription drug coverage will not work. Such coverage would constitute an empty promise to Medicare beneficiaries." Insurance companies are refusing to participate in such a program. The State of Nevada tried to implement a private insurance model quite similar



to the Republican plan which passed through Congress. They could not find one single qualified insurance company even willing to offer the coverage, because they knew it couldn't be done at an affordable rate, and they didn't want to be accused of perpetrating a fraud on the seniors in the State.

It's clear that this plan that passed with the votes of the Republican majority is basically designed for the pharmaceutical companies who make the drugs, not the seniors who take them. Now, why would they do that? Because they believe that if we have a Medicare program, we will be able to buy these pharmaceuticals in bulk and get you a better price and because charging higher prices for Americans recovers all the research costs of these drugs, and that enables them to sell the drugs for a profit at much lower prices in other countries, which is why I'm sure you've seen all these stories about people taking buses to Canada to buy their drugs. Unfortunately, Florida is nowhere near North Dakota, so that's not an option for most of you. *[Laughter]* But that's what's going on here. And it's unbelievable to me.

What are we going to do with our prosperity? This week—and you may hear if you turn on the television, the Republicans when they meet in Philadelphia in convention talking about all their tax cut bills and how wonderful they'd be for you. But what they don't say is that if you take all their tax cut proposals in total, it spends the entire projected surplus of the country for the next 10 years. Congressman Davis just came in, your Congressman—he was nodding his head. So I want to acknowledge you. Thank you for being here, sir.

They spent—you know, they're trying to put the heat on him. They're trying to say, "Well, people in Tampa ought to be mad at him. He's not voting for all these tax cuts. Aren't they good?" It kind of reminds me of going to a cafeteria. When I go to a cafeteria, everything I see looks good. *[Laughter]* But if I eat it all, I'll get sick. *[Laughter]*

Now, that's what's going on here. So they talk about all these wonderful tax cuts. If they become the law, there will be nothing left from the projected surplus for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, nothing left to lengthen the life of Social Security and Medi-

care, so when the baby boomers retire we don't break our kids and our grandkids, nothing left to invest in the education of our children.

There's something else I'd like to say that all of you can probably identify with. This is a projected surplus. This is what we think we'll get over the next 10 years. Did you ever get one of those letters from Ed McMahon? *[Laughter]* You know, it probably said, "You may have won \$10 million." Did you ever get one? "You may have won \$10 million." Now, if you went out and spent the \$10 million the next day, you should support their plan. *[Laughter]* But, if not, you ought to think again there.

When you cut these taxes, the money's gone. And I think it's wrong to spend it all. Just this week, we released a report that showed that one of their spending proposals, the total repeal of the estate tax, would benefit only 4,300 families in Florida, with an average tax cut of \$434,000. Now, I think there ought to be some changes in the estate tax. I think the rate's too high. I think too many family businesses are burdened by it. And I'm all for changing it. I've offered to change it. But to completely repeal it without taking account of the need here for prescription drugs is a big mistake.

While 4,300 families in Florida would benefit from the estate tax repeal, the Medicare prescription drug benefit would provide affordable coverage to more than 2.7 million seniors and people with disabilities in Florida. Their average income is \$18,600.

Even by Congress's own optimistic efforts, I will say again, these tax bills leave nothing for Medicare, for lengthening the life of Social Security, and for the drug program, or for education for our children, plus which, they'd make it impossible for us to pay this country out of debt by 2012. One of the things I've been trying to do is get us out of debt. We quadrupled the debt of the country in the 12 years before I took office, and we're trying to get rid of it. If we get rid of it, interest rates will be lower; incomes will be higher; people will pay less for home mortgages—\$250 billion over 10 years, by our estimates—less for car loans, less for college loans. That's the equivalent of a big tax

cut, lower interest rates. So I think this is very, very important.

Now, there is a better way. The budget that I gave the Congress continues our fiscal discipline. It would get us out of debt by 2012, for the first time since 1835, and it would put us in great shape for the 21st century. It would extend the life of the Social Security Trust Fund by more than 50 years. It would extend the life of Medicare by over 30 years. Medicare was supposed to go broke last year when I took office.

It provides, believe it or not, tax cuts—affordable tax cuts—to help people send their kids to college, pay for long-term care for the elderly and disabled—a big deal—pay for child care, pay for retirement savings, allow people between the ages of 55 and 65 to buy into Medicare and give them a tax benefit to do so, because so many of them have lost their insurance, and provide marriage penalty tax relief. And believe it or not, our plan only costs one-fourth as much as theirs does, but it would provide more benefits to 80 percent of the people.

So there is a way to have a tax cut here and have the money to pay for the Medicare prescription drug program, to lengthen the life of Medicare and Social Security, to invest in the education of our children. And believe it or not, I still leave a lot of this projected surplus alone, in my budget, in case it doesn't materialize, or in case it does materialize, the next President and the next Congress can make a judgment about what to do with it. I just don't believe in spending all this money before it comes in. We've tried it before, and it didn't work out too well.

So I hope that all of you will raise your voices. This is not a partisan political issue in America. When you go to the pharmacist to fill a prescription, nobody asks you whether you voted Republican or Democrat for the last 40 years. Nobody asks whether you vote at all. You're just a person, and you need the medicine. It should not be a partisan political issue in Washington. We have the money. We can do it, provide a tax cut, invest in our children, and still get the country out of debt. All we have to do is decide what our priorities are, how much we care about it, how much people like the people on this

stage and in this room matter to us, and what kind of America we want to live in.

So I ask you all, because it's not a partisan issue out here, do what you can with your Senators and your Representatives. Raise your voices. Tell them it shouldn't be a partisan issue in Washington. You've got a lot of lives depending on it. And it's only going to become more and more important.

You know, we're on the verge of breakthroughs for Parkinson's, for various kinds of cancers, with the Human Genome Project, which I'm sure you read about. We've now sequenced the human gene in its entirety. It won't be long; in the next 10 years, it's going to take your breath away what we learn how to correct in terms of human health problems.

I believe that these young children here will, themselves, have children that will have a life expectancy at birth in excess of 90 years. But if we want to do this—this is a high-class problem—I believe people with disabilities will find ways to remedy a lot of the disabilities, and they will be able to live longer and better lives and have more options. But all of that will require us to rely more heavily on medicine—not less, more.

We have put this off long enough. We finally have the money to do it. And I think, as a country, we're morally obligated to do it. So I ask you to raise your voices. Stick with us. Let's keep working on it until we get it done.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12 p.m. in the activity room. In his remarks, he referred to Paul Herrera, president, Barksdale Center Golden Age Club; Bill Nelson, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate from Florida; Mayor Dick A. Greco of Tampa; senior citizen Sylvia Kessler, who introduced the President; and Ed McMahon, spokesperson, Publishers' Clearinghouse Sweepstakes.

### **Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Luncheon in Tampa**

*July 31, 2000*

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your warm welcome, and

I want to thank Bill Nelson for his introduction. It's amazing how, if you've sort of got one leg in the political grave, people think you're doing a better job. [Laughter] Let me say how delighted I am to be here.

I remember well the first time I came to a fundraiser in Tampa in 1992 early, early, early, early. Some of you were there then. And I particularly appreciate it because at that time, my mother was the only voting American who thought I could win. [Laughter] And a lot of things have happened in the last 8 years and some odd months, and I have been very honored to serve. And I thank you all for coming today.

I first want to acknowledge Congressman Jim Davis. He's doing a wonderful job for you in the House, and he's a real treasure. He's been a stand-up guy. And for someone without a lot of seniority, he has both had a big impact, and he's been willing to cast brave votes, and I'm very grateful to him. And even though the light is blinding my weakening eyes, I think I see Sam Gibbons out there. And I thank you, sir.

I want to thank Mayor Greco for his warm welcome. I have loved my visits with him here. I'm like Jim, I like to see a person who likes his job. If there's anything I can't stand it's to hear somebody in public office complain. You know, nobody makes us take these jobs. You've got to work like crazy to get them, and as soon as you give one up, somebody else wants it. [Laughter] So he never made any pretense of the fact that he loves this city, and he loves his job, and he's been a dream to work with.

I'd like to thank Ben Hill Griffin and Chris Hoyer and Jim Wilkes for chairing this event and for harassing the rest of you to give money to it. [Laughter] I'd like to thank Buddy MacKay for coming over here with me today and for the brilliant job he's doing as our Envoy to the Americas, and the leadership that he showed in passing our trade bill on the Caribbean Basin earlier this year. We can be very proud of that.

I thank the other people here who are running for Congress. We just need five more seats to win the House, and maybe we saw a couple of them here today. And I thank Bob Poe for chairing the Democratic Party

here. This is going to be a good State, I think, for us in November if we do the right things.

Most important of all, though, I want to say that I'm honored to be here for Bill Nelson. I've known Bill for, I don't know, years and years and years, a long time. And he and Grace have been friends of Hillary and mine for years. They and their children came to the White House and stayed with us one night. And we stayed up later than we should have, talking. And we've had the opportunity over the years at various encounters to get to know one another, and I think the world of both of them. And I think that we need more people like them in Washington, people who are civil and decent and reasonable and caring, and not just in election season, not just as a part of a marketing strategy but because they think it's the right thing to do. And he's been an absolutely superb insurance commissioner, and he would be a superb United States Senator.

Let me say to all of you, it has been the great—obviously—the great honor of my life to serve as President. I can't believe all the time that's passed. When I ran for President, I did so against all the odds, when no one thought I could win, because I believed the country was going in the wrong direction and was coming apart when it ought to be coming together. And I thought that the Washington political system was never going to serve America well unless it got shaken up and changed.

And if we have had some measure of success up there, I think in no small degree it's because Al Gore and I went up there with a set of ideas for specific things we wanted to do, rooted in the values of creating opportunity for every responsible American and creating a community in which all Americans feel a part, in a world where we're still the leading force for peace and freedom and prosperity.

Now, even though we faced intense partisan opposition at almost every turn of the road, it turned out the ideas worked pretty well for America. You know, when I passed the economic plan in 1993, without a vote to spare, only Democrats voting for it, to bring the deficit down, Al Gore breaking the tie vote in the Senate. As he says, his record

since we've been there is a lot better than mine; whenever he votes, we win. [*Laughter*]

I remember how our friends in the Republican Party said, oh, it would be the end of civilization as we knew it. My terrible, terrible economic program was going to bankrupt the country. It was going to weaken the economy. We'd have a terrible recession. The deficit would get worse. This was from a crowd that had quadrupled the debt of the country in 12 years, telling me how bad I was. And then, lo and behold, it didn't work out the way they said it would.

By the time we got ready to pass the bipartisan balanced budget amendment in '97 all the hard work had been done. And we got more than two-thirds of both parties in both Houses to vote for that. And now we've had, as all of you know, the longest economic expansion in history. That's given us over 22 million new jobs and the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, and the highest homeownership in history, and greater social justice—lowest child poverty rate in 20 years, lowest minority unemployment rate ever recorded, the lowest female unemployment rate in 40 years, the lowest rate of single-parent household poverty in 46 years. So we're moving in the right direction. This thing is going as it should.

But the big question in this election is, what do we propose to do with our prosperity? That is the big issue. And I think that, as Bill Nelson goes out across this State between now and November, whether he wins or not—and I believe he will—depends in no small measure on what people believe the election's about. You might ask yourself just quietly, what do you think it's about? The only trouble we've got in this election right now, anywhere in America, is the confusion that exists about what the differences are between the candidates for President, Senate, Congress, and the two parties.

There was a big story in one of our major national newspapers the other day; the American people are not sure there's much difference in economic policy. A big story in one of the other newspapers about 4 days ago about an interview system with a lot of suburban women who wanted more gun safety legislation had no earthly idea what the difference between the two candidates was.

And I say that because I think there are three things you need to know about this election. One is, it's a huge, profoundly important election, just as important as the election in 1992. Why? Because what a country does with its prosperity is just as stern a test of its judgment, its values, and its character as what it does with adversity. You didn't have to be a genius to know we had to do something different in '92.

I'll never forget when Hillary gave me that little saying that somebody gave us that said the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. [*Laughter*] So you didn't have to be a genius to figure out we had to change.

So now we are at the time in our history, maybe unique in our history, when we had this unique combination of enormous economic prosperity, improving social progress, welfare rolls cut in half, crime at a 25-year low, teen pregnancy down, every social indicator going in the right direction. And we don't have a domestic crisis or a foreign threat sufficiently grave to distract us. What are we going to do about it? That's a big issue.

The second thing you need to know about the election is that there are big differences. And the decisions the voters make in all these races will have significant consequences in how we live our lives and what we do with our prosperity and what kind of people we are.

And then the third thing you need to know is that in this election year only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are—[*laughter*]*—*which is a pretty good indicator of who you ought to vote for.

Now, what do I mean by that? Well, on our side, led by Vice President Gore, we've got a group of men and women who want to keep our prosperity going by getting this country out of debt, continuing to invest in education and in the future of our economy, having affordable tax cuts, and providing drug coverage for our seniors on Medicare.

On their side, their main argument, as near as I can tell is, "We want to be inclusive and compassionate and spend the whole surplus on tax cuts, but be nice about it while we're doing it." And actually, their argument is

easier to sell than ours. Their argument is, "Hey, this is your money. We're going to give it back to you. Wouldn't you like to have it?"

Now, then there are all these issues they don't talk about. So what I would like to tell you is what I honestly believe the differences are because I want you to share them with your friends and neighbors who would never come here. But it's very important. No point in having an election if the people don't know what the differences are and don't understand what the consequences are. And I'll just start with the economy.

Their side says, "We've got this big projected surplus, and we're going to give it back to you in tax cuts." And, as I said earlier today, every one of these tax cuts sounds good. And they're doing it—they're smarter this year—this year's tax cut—last year was just one big, omnibus bill. This year, they're doing it salami style, passing a little along so they all sound good. But when you add them all up, and especially you put the new ones they're committing to in Philadelphia, it's the entire proposed surplus. So every one of them looks good, but it's kind of like going to a cafeteria. Every time I go to a cafeteria, everything I see looks good. But if I eat it all, I'll get sick. Think about it.

So that's their position. Their economic policy is, "Let's do what we did before. Who cares if we go back to deficits?" And they'll spend it all on tax cuts before they even keep their own spending promises. Never mind what emergencies come up. Our position is different. It is, "Hey, let's remember how we got to this dance today. We got here by getting rid of this deficit, getting interest rates down, getting it where people could invest and grow the economy. So let's keep paying down the debt, save some money back to invest in education and to lengthen the life of Medicare and Social Security, so when the baby boomers retire they don't bankrupt their kids, and provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors on Medicare. Let's have a tax cut and focus it on paying for long-term care, for college, for child care, helping working people with a lot of kids, and helping people with their retirement. Ours costs 25 percent of what theirs does and does way more good for 80 percent of the people."

And then we say, "Then let's save several hundred billion dollars of this projected surplus and let the next President and the next Congress decide what to do over the next several years as we see whether the money comes in." Now, this—I can hardly tell you how important this is.

We've worked really hard to get this country turned around, to get this economy going. And their position is, "Let's spend all the projected surplus." Did you ever get one of those letters in the mail from Ed McMahon, you know, from the Publishers' Clearinghouse? "You may have won \$10 million." [Laughter] Did you go out and spend that \$10 million the next day? [Laughter] If you did, you should support them in this election. [Laughter] But if you didn't, you'd better stick with us. If you want to live like a Republican, you've got to vote for the Democrats this year. [Laughter] This is important. This is a big deal.

Now, the second issue, education—what's our program? Our program is that we should take the limited Federal dollars we have and spend it on more teachers in the classrooms, training those teachers better, modernizing and repairing schools—because you know here in Florida how many schools you have—right here in Tampa, I've been to a school, a high school right here in Tampa, just full of house trailers behind, in back. We need to help deal with this issue.

We want to help people go to college. And we want to say to schools all over America, school districts, "You've got to turn these schools around or shut them down. No more failing schools."

Now, here's the good news: Student performance is going up. All over America failing schools are turning around. I was in Spanish Harlem in New York City the other day, in a school that 2 years ago had 80 percent of its kids—listen to this, now—80 percent doing English and math below grade level—2 years ago. Today, 74 percent of them are doing English and math at or above grade level, in 2 years.

I've been in schools in Columbus, Ohio, and rural Kentucky, all over America that were failing that are turned around, without regard to the racial or economic backgrounds

of the kids in the school. We know how to do it. That's our position.

Their position is: The Federal money investment in education should be spent on block grants and vouchers. I think we're right. You have to decide. But we have some evidence that our plan works. And in the economy, we've sure got all the evidence we need. All you've got to do—we tried it their way for 12 years and our way for 8 years. Compare our 8 years to their 12 and make up your mind.

In crime, let's talk about that. Our position is: More police on the street, do more to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and kids. And they said when I signed the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban—they terrified all these hunters and said I was going to take their guns away and how awful it was. I heard all that stuff all over America. It's one of the reasons we lost the House in 1994. When I went back to New Hampshire in 1996, where they beat one of those Congressmen, I said, "You know, you guys beat your Democratic Congressman up here because he voted for my crime bill. And if a person in this audience"—and I got all these hunters together—I said, "If one of you missed a day in the deer woods, I want you to vote against me, too, because he did it for me. But if you didn't miss a day in the deer woods, they didn't tell you the truth, and you need to get even." And our margin of victory in New Hampshire went up by 12 percent in 4 years. [Laughter]

This country has a lower crime rate than we've had in 25 years. Gun crime has gone down by 35 percent. So what do we say? We say, "Let's put more police on the street in the high crime neighborhoods. Let's close the gun show loophole in the background check law"—which you voted to do in Florida, overwhelmingly—"have mandatory child safety locks, and stop importing these large capacity ammunition clips which allow the manufacturers to get around the assault weapons ban." That's what we say.

What do they say? Throw the book at anybody that violates the law and have more people carrying concealed weapons, even in church. Now, you have to decide which side you agree with. But it's not like you don't have any evidence here. We tried it our way,

and we tried it their way. And crime goes down more our way.

Now, the third thing I would like to say something about is health care. I said, we're for adding a voluntary prescription drug benefit to Medicare. They are for making people buy private insurance and subsidizing it for people up to 150 percent of the poverty line. The only problem with their program is, even the insurance companies say there is no way to have stand-alone health insurance for prescription drugs.

Nevada passed a program just like the ones the Republicans in Congress passed, and not a single, solitary insurance company would offer the drugs because it won't work, and they didn't want to participate in a fraud. Now, this is a huge deal in Florida, but it's a big deal all over America for the elderly, the disabled.

Our program is for the drug users; theirs is for the drug makers. It is not a complicated thing. You just have to decide how important this is and whether you're willing to pay the price of our seniors never getting it if you don't support the Democrats. And you need to go tell people in Florida. We're for a Patients' Bill of Rights, and they're not.

Let's take the environment. I've worked real hard here on a program that would balance all the interests to save the Florida Everglades. I'm really proud of it. The Vice President worked hard on it. We really have labored to try to support you in what you're doing in Florida. And we saved a lot of Yellowstone Park from a gold mine, and we set aside more land in perpetuity in the lower 48 States than any administration in history except those of the two Roosevelts. And we proved, I think, that you could have cleaner air, cleaner water, and safer food and still have a stronger economy, because we raised all the environmental standards. We just did it in a sensible way.

Now, what's their position? Their position will be to weaken that direction, to repeal—one specific commitment they've already made is to repeal my order setting aside 43 million roadless acres in the national forests. The Audubon Society says it's the most significant conservation move in the last 40 years. They say they'll get rid of it. And they'll allow oil drilling in some places where we

haven't. And apparently, they're committed to weaker regulations on the chemical industry.

Now, I've done everything I could to create jobs and be pro-business. But I think we've got to be pro-environment and pro-business. And you just have to decide which side you want to be on and what you think the best thing is for America. And these are the kinds of questions people have to be asked.

The same thing is true with regard to one America. One of the things that I want to do is make sure that we're all going along for the ride here. We're for raising the minimum wage for people that can never afford to come to a dinner like this but may be serving it. I think it's unconscionable that it's still below what it was in 1982 in purchasing power terms when we've got 4 percent unemployment. It's just wrong. Nobody ought to work full-time for a living and have kids that are still below the poverty line. It's wrong. But they're not for it.

Now, they're sort of being quiet on it now because the last time they fought me on it 4 years ago, they said it would cost jobs, and we created 11 million jobs since we passed it. So they really don't have a justification anymore. They can't—they're kind of embarrassed to say they're not for it, but they're not for it yet. If we turn up the heat enough between now and election, they will get it. But it's a big difference.

We're for hate crimes legislation, and they're basically not for it. Oh, a few of them are, but the leadership is not, and the nominee is not because it protects gays. Well, I think everybody ought to be protected from hate crimes, which is a crime, an assault on you just because of who you are. But you can decide whether you agree with that or not. But that's where we are.

And there will be a big impact on the courts. The next President will appoint two to four judges on the Supreme Court, and the Senate will have to decide whether to confirm them or reject them. This is a huge decision. Their nominee says his favorite judges are Justice Thomas and Justice Scalia, by far the most conservative judges on the Court. That's what he said. And so you have

to decide, because there will be big consequences.

So if you just go back, here we are with this—a whole future before us, with all these opportunities out there, and you should be happy. We don't have to have one of these negative campaigns like we used to have for 20 years that were mostly brought to us by their side, trying to convince you that whoever their opponent was was just one step above a car thief. [Laughter] I recommend we just call timeout and say everybody running this year is a good, patriotic American. They are men and women who love their families and love their country and will do what they think is right, but they have honest disagreements. They disagree over economic policy and educational policy and health care policy and environmental policy and crime policy and civil rights policy, and what it means to be an American citizen and what kind of individual rights you should have as guaranteed by the Supreme Court. And we want to have a debate over that.

Now, their strategy is to blur all that. I'll be very surprised if you hear anybody say this week at their meeting what I just said to you, even though I have tried to be exceedingly faithful to the differences between the two parties. And their strategy is to talk about compassion and all. It's a brilliant strategy. It's a pretty package, and they're hoping if they wrap it tight enough, nobody will open it before Christmas. [Laughter]

And what we've got to do is try to make sure that the American people open the package in September and October, so they will know. I trust the American people. They almost always get it right. Otherwise, we wouldn't still be here after over 200 years. And if everybody understands exactly what the choices are and the Vice President doesn't win or Bill Nelson doesn't win, we'd be all right about that. But the truth is, if everybody understands exactly what the choices are, Bill Nelson will be the next Senator; Al Gore will be the next President; we will win the House of Representatives. Why? Because our economic policies, our educational policies, our health care policies are right for the country. Because the idea of building one America, not just with words but with deeds, and giving everybody a

chance to participate in this brilliant future of science and technology in this global economy is the right thing for the country and the right thing for our children's future. That's why.

I'm telling you, as much, as many good things that have happened in the last 8 years, believe me, all the great stuff is still out there. But there are big challenges. Look at Florida's school kids, how diverse they are. If you want this country to be where it ought to be, every one of them has got to be able to get a good education. We have to figure out how, when all us baby boomers retire and the average 65-year-old can look forward to living to be 83, we're going to manage that without bankrupting our kids and grandkids.

We have to figure out how to make the most of this scientific and technological revolution. One of the reasons I want Al Gore to be President, apart from my personal relationship with him, is that I have studied very hard the impacts of the information technology revolution, the impacts of the genome revolution, what's likely to happen over the next 10 years. It seems to me that you want somebody that can make the most of the computer revolution and still protect your financial and medical records and not let somebody get at them unless you say okay. It seems to me you want somebody who can help make the most of this scientific revolution without letting somebody deny you a job or promotion or raise or health insurance because of your little gene map. It seems to me we ought to have somebody in the White House that understands the future.

And I know we ought to have people in the Senate who have the values and the judgment and just the way of operating that Bill Nelson does. Believe me, I've done everything I could to turn this country around, and the only thing now we have to decide is, what is this election about? If people really say, this election is about what shall we do with this moment of prosperity, how can we meet the big challenges and seize the big opportunities out there, Bill Nelson will be just fine.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:04 p.m. in the Audubon Ballroom at the Hyatt Regency Westshore. In his remarks, he referred to Bill

Nelson, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate from Florida, and his wife, Grace; Mayor Dick A. Greco of Tampa; former Representative Sam M. Gibbons; Ben Hill Griffin III, Chris Hoyer, and Jim Wilkes, luncheon cohosts; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush of Texas.

## Interview With Kelly Ring of WTVT Television in Tampa

July 31, 2000

### Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit

**Ms. Ring.** First of all, let's talk about why you came. And that's Medicare, and you know—I mean, this is something that's been important to you for a long time—getting Medicare, part of the prescription drug program included in Medicare. Talk about why that is so important to have that.

**The President.** Well, Medicare is a program that's 35 years old, and it's been a godsend for 35 years for a lot of our seniors. But when it was established, most of medicine was about doctors and hospitals and very little about prescription drugs. Now, the average 65-year-old has a life expectancy of 82 or 83 years, the highest in the world for seniors. And more and more, people need these drugs to stay alive and also to stay healthy.

Over and above that, America has about 5 million people on disability who are eligible for Medicare, and they need the medicine even more. So what we have been saying is, "Look, we've got this surplus. We have the money. We should add a voluntary prescription drug benefit to Medicare, because we have, all over America, seniors who are choosing every week between food and medicine because they can't pay their medical bills and because there is no other viable way to give them the medicine they need."

So I proposed this program, and I told the American people how we can add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, still have a family tax cut, still invest in education, and keep paying us out of debt. I think that it is so critical to provide for the elderly and disabled in America.

**Ms. Ring.** Do you think it will happen before you leave office?



**The President.** I just don't know. I think the problem is the Republicans in the Congress believe that the program might be too expensive, although it's not nearly as expensive as their combined tax cuts, and they want—they also want a private insurance plan. But the bill they passed is just like one that got passed in Nevada, and not a single insurance company would offer the drug coverage because they knew they couldn't offer it at an affordable price. So the plan they passed is unworkable.

Now, what's really going on here is that the pharmaceutical companies that make the drugs, they have reservations about it because they're afraid that if you put 39 million seniors, including 2.7 million seniors in Florida and 5 million disabled people, if you look at all of them and a significant percentage of them get in one program, that the people buying drugs for that one program will have too much marketing power, and they'll get the drugs for too cheap.

Because what happens is, our pharmaceutical companies charge Americans more for drugs to cover all the research costs in America. Then they can sell them much, much cheaper in Canada or Mexico. You've seen all these press stories about people going there.

Now, I just think that's not a very good reason to deprive senior citizens of medicine, and I don't think it's a partisan issue outside Washington. I think out here in Tampa or in Arkansas or New York or California, nobody asks you what party you're in when you go to the drugstore to buy medicine. In Washington, it's become part of an issue because the drug companies are against providing prescription drug coverage for Medicare. It doesn't sound reasonable, but it's true.

#### **Florida and the 2000 Presidential Election**

**Ms. Ring.** Let's talk about the importance of Florida for this Presidential election. I know that you know how important Florida is. We have a Republican Governor—popular. His brother is running, but tell me what the Democrats are going to do to win Florida. Do you think they can?

**The President.** Well, absolutely. For one thing, I think we've worked very hard here for 8 years. We brought the Southern Command to Miami. We brought the Summit of the Americas to Florida. We worked on the plan to save the Florida Everglades. We have worked on trade policy. Our trade policy has helped a lot of Florida economic sectors.

I was just here with Congressman Davis meeting with people from the Tampa area who would benefit greatly from the opening of trade to China. So I think we've got a strong record to run on. If you look at Tampa when I became President, unemployment here was 7.1 percent. Now it's 2.7 percent. So, first we're going to run on our record. It's been good for America and good for Florida, and Al Gore will continue that economic policy, and I think that's important.

Then, the second thing I think is just what we have to do is get out the differences on the issues. For example, Senator Graham has a bill of his own to provide prescription drugs for seniors that is a little different from ours but essentially in the same ballpark. And I know how much credibility he has with the Florida voters. So we can talk about Medicare, and we can talk about education, and we can talk about paying the debt off.

I think when you see the Vice President and his running mate and Bill Nelson and all of these other Democrats out there just having a conversation with the people, we don't have to have a mean election this year. This year the economy is in great shape. The country is doing well, and we ought to have an old-fashioned citizenship lesson in this election. We ought to say, "Here are the differences. You choose."

#### **Differing Visions of the Future**

**Ms. Ring.** And it's like you said in the speech a little while ago, you're talking about the differences. The Democrats are, but the Republicans aren't. Elaborate a little bit on that.

**The President.** Well, I think it's because they know that there is a tendency in the country to give the other crowd a chance after they've been out a while, and they know

that Governor Bush is an immensely charming, attractive man, and Mr. Cheney, Congressman Cheney, is a very nice man and has had Washington experience.

So what they want to do is to seem safe and reliable and compassionate and inclusive. So they're not going to be up there saying, "Vote for us. Our favorite Supreme Court judges are Justice Thomas and Justice Scalia, and we're going to repeal *Roe v. Wade*," but that's what's going to happen. But they're not going to say that. They're not going to be up there saying, "Vote for us. We want to weaken air pollution laws on the chemical industry," or, "Vote for us. We want to make sure that we don't have a Medicare prescription drug program that works," or, "Vote for us. We're going to give all your money away in tax cuts, and we'll have higher interest rates and a deficit."

But what I think is important is, they should be able to defend their policies, but what they want to do is to obscure the differences. I see this as I travel from State to State now. They accuse the Democrats of running negative campaigns if they have advertisements pointing out how the Republicans voted. It's like they're almost saying, "We have a right to obscure our record from the people if you want."

What I think the voters need is clarity of difference. There are honest differences between these candidates. Let them state the differences honestly, but don't pretend the differences don't exist, because an election is a choice, and choices have consequences. And the American people should know the choice, know the consequences, and then make up their mind.

And there are real differences on economic policy, on health care policy, on crime policy, on environmental policy, on policies relating to civil rights and individual liberty; profound differences, not just between the Vice President and Governor Bush but between these candidates for Senate, in this case, Bill Nelson and his opponent here—right around the country. And what we should do is to say, "Hey, this country is in great shape now, and we have a unique moment in history to make the most of our prosperity. So we'll bring our ideas; they'll bring theirs. Let's clarify the differences. Let's

don't say bad things about our opponents. Let's assume everybody is patriotic, loves their family, loves their country, is honest, and would do what they have said they would do. But let's don't pretend that they didn't say they would do some of the things they said they would do. Let's just clarify the differences, and let the people make their mind up." That's my whole theory of the election.

### **Hillary Clinton's Senate Campaign**

**Ms. Ring.** Sounds pretty good. But let me ask you: Now that you're in the last few months of your Presidency, your wife is just beginning her own political career.

**The President.** I'm very proud of her.

**Ms. Ring.** I know you are so proud of her. But on the other side, politics is mean-spirited. How do you feel about that?

**The President.** It hurts me. I get more nervous about her than I ever did about me, and everybody that always hated me all those years and were so mean to me, they've all transferred all their anger to her now. It's almost as if they've got one last chance to beat me. And then there are some people who voted for me that think they're mad at her because she's running in New York, and we just bought a home there.

All I can say to them is, it wasn't her idea. The New York Democratic House delegation came to her and asked her to run. And before she said she would do it, she said, "I'm going to go up there and look around, talk to people, and see if I could serve." She spent almost a year doing that, and then finally she decided that she would like to serve if they wanted her to.

So I think if we can get this election again in a position where they just look at who's got the greatest strength, who's got the ability to do more, and which candidate do they agree, I think she'll do fine. I'm really proud of her, though. It's a really brave thing to do.

**Ms. Ring.** It certainly is. As you said, it makes you very nervous thinking about what she's getting into.

**The President.** I guess when you're in a campaign, you don't have time to think about it. But I spend a lot more time worrying about her than I ever did worrying about myself when I was out there running. I feel like

I just wake up every day wishing I could do something else to help.

### **Post-Presidential Plans**

**Ms. Ring.** What are you going to do when you leave office? Everybody's talked about all kinds of things, and I know you probably haven't decided yet. I mean, everything—

**The President.** Well, I'm going to build a library and a public policy center at home in Arkansas. I know I'm going to do that. And I'll be there a couple of days a week. And then I'll probably be with Hillary a couple of days a week in New York. And then, of course, she'll have to work in Washington if this election goes well, and I believe it will. So I'll just decide what to do.

There are a lot of things that I have in mind to do, but I don't think I really should make final decisions until after I leave here. What I want to do is to spend every last waking moment I can doing as much as I can for the people of America. And that's what this job is.

When I lay the job down, then I would like to rest a bit and have a clear head and decide what to do. I'll try to find something to do to be useful for the rest of my life. I think I'll be able to find something to do.

### **Chelsea Clinton**

**Ms. Ring.** You're so young, so you've got so many opportunities.

You've got to be so proud of your daughter, Chelsea. I mean, we reported last week she's made a decision to take a break and spend time with you—that's wonderful—and to help her mom campaign.

**The President.** It's wonderful. When your children grow up—I can say, now that I have this experience—you're always mildly surprised when they still want to spend time with you and completely relieved and happy. So you know, she's lived 40 percent of her life in the White House. She's 20, and she was just, when we came here in '92, she was still 12 years old. She was actually—I mean, in '93 she was still 12 years old. She had her 13th birthday in the White House, in February.

So she's been here for 40 percent of her life, and she's got more credits than she needs to graduate from college, and she told

me that she was interested in doing three things: She wanted to help her mother some; she wanted to be with me when I would otherwise be alone; and—like, she went up to Camp David with me and stayed the whole 15 days and kept everybody in a good humor.

She flew to Okinawa with me, and she did a great job. And I think the third thing she wants is just to be in a place that has been her home for nearly half her life, every night she can be. Because she knows when she leaves, it's for good, you know, and she'll never be back, I mean, as a resident. So I think it's a very smart decision for her, and I'm thrilled.

**Ms. Ring.** Because I'm sure you must be, because here she was just a young girl, and now she's a young woman. It's been so wonderful. I mean, everybody's fallen in love with her. She's just a very special person.

**The President.** I think she's an unusual young woman, and we're very proud of her and very grateful. And I think it's great. You know, tomorrow she and her mother are going to Long Island together. They'll have a big time. I think it's great.

### **Middle East Peace Process**

**Ms. Ring.** One more—can I ask about Middle East peace, because I know how important that is. You spent 3 tough weeks. Do you ever foresee a time when there is going to be peace in the region, and is Jerusalem the sticking point there?

**The President.** The answer to both questions is basically yes. I think—yes, I think there will be peace in the region; yes, Jerusalem is the most difficult issue. They did not agree on everything else, but they're close enough that I think that we can still get an agreement.

Just a few hours ago, before we sat down for this interview, the Barak government, Prime Minister Barak's government in Israel was confirmed in a no confidence vote; that is, they didn't vote him out of office. So I think now, we just have to see if we can get some movement from the Palestinians, as well, and see if we can put this thing together again.

If they want it, they can get it, because they're close enough now. They can get it. And I saw something after we had been there

2 weeks—sort of the body language that the Israelis and the Palestinians, the way they relate to each other. They know each other. They call each other by their first names. They know they're neighbors, whether they like it or not. They know their future is together, whether they would always want it to be or not. And they know their children are going to have to be partners and hopefully friends; and I think they'll find a way. I do believe that.

I think it's just a question of making sure that we keep pushing them. When you deal with issues this difficult and this painful, it's like going to the dentist without having your gums deadened. You're not going to do it unless somebody herds you on, and you do it.

But the calendar is working against them a little bit, because they have pledged to finish by the 13th of September. And that puts all kind of pressure, especially on the Palestinians. So they've got to keep working right now. They've got to do everything they can to get as much as they can done over the next 6 weeks.

I think they will, and America's role is just to help. They've got to make the decisions and live with them, but we'll do everything we can to help.

**Ms. Ring.** Will you try to bring them back to Camp David?

**The President.** I can't say yet. It's too premature to make a decision. What I will try to do is do whatever I can to get the peace process up and going and to bring it to a speedy conclusion. But I do not know, honestly do not know, as we sit here and talk, what would be the most helpful.

Thanks.

**Ms. Ring.** Thank you very much for doing this.

**The President.** Okay.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 3:30 p.m. in the Presidential Suite at the Hyatt Regency Westshore for later broadcast. In his remarks, the President referred to Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush of Texas and Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney; Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel; and Bill Nelson, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate from Florida. Ms. Ring referred to Gov. Jeb Bush of Flor-

ida. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

## Statement on the National Debt

July 31, 2000

When I came into office, the debt had quadrupled since 1980 and was projected to rise even further. As a result of the 1993 and 1997 budget agreements and tough choices every year, we have been able to turn this situation around. Today the Department of the Treasury is announcing that the United States will pay off \$221 billion of debt this year—the largest one-year debt paydown in American history. This will be the third consecutive year of debt reduction, bringing the 3-year total to \$360 billion.

This positive news is further confirmation that we should stay on the path of fiscal discipline and not endanger the longest economic expansion in history with a series of expensive tax cuts which would spend every single dime of our projected surplus. The Republican tax plan leaves nothing for strengthening Social Security and Medicare, nothing for a real voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit, and nothing for education. And the Republican plan would take us off the path of paying off the entire national debt by 2012. This is the wrong approach for America.

## Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Reception in Palm Beach, Florida

July 31, 2000

Thank you very much. I am so happy to be here. All of you know I love Florida. A good portion of my wife's family has lived down here for the last 15 years and more. I got my start in Florida twice, once in December of 1991—everyone knows about that—when the Florida straw poll came out with a majority for me against six opponents and got me started, and I'm very grateful for that. But once, maybe only one person in this room remembers, and that was in early 1981 when I had the distinction of being the youngest former Governor in the history of America, when I was defeated in the Reagan

landslide of 1980, Bob Graham still invited me to come speak to the Florida Democratic Convention to explain how it was that I got my brains beat out in the hope that others could avoid a similar fate. *[Laughter]* I have never forgotten it, never stopped feeling indebted. And Bob asked me back three more times after that, and I think that had a lot to do with what happened in 1991, so I'm very grateful to him.

I'm grateful that both Bob and Adele and Bill and Grace Nelson have been friends of Hillary's and friends of mine for a very long time now. And Bill and Grace and their children have spent the night in the White House. And Bill was making fun of me because his daughter used to call Chelsea, and from time to time I, like every father of a teenage daughter, I was the answering service. *[Laughter]* The Presidency doesn't alleviate some responsibilities in life.

We've had a great relationship, all of us, all six of us have now for such a long time, and I'm so honored that Bill is running for the Senate, so grateful.

I want to just—I'll be brief tonight because I know I'm preaching to the saved here. But Florida is very important. We have to win the Senate race, and you have to carry it for the Vice President, and you can. And I believe in 1996, early on election night, when I saw that we had carried Florida, I knew the election was over. And in 2000, early on election night, if the polls show we have carried Florida, the election is over. And I want you to understand that.

I have—Al Gore and I have spent a lot of time in Florida over the last 7½ years. We worked with many of the people here in south Florida to save the Everglades, to bring the Southern Command here from Panama, to bring the Summit of the Americas here, to work to expand trade. We just passed the Caribbean Basin trade bill which will be very good for southern Florida. And I can't thank Bob Graham enough for the help and support and wise counsel he's given me over these entire two terms.

But here's what I want you to think about. What about everybody who's not here tonight? Do you believe that everyone you know who is a friend of yours knows what this election is about? Do you believe that

everyone you know has a clear idea about what the differences are between Bill and his opponent, between the Vice President and Governor Bush and Mr. Cheney? Do you believe that? You know it's not true, don't you? They don't. Why is that, and what are we going to do about it?

There are three things you need to know about this election. One is, it is a very big election. It is every bit as important, maybe over the long run of our life, more important than the election in 1992. I'll come back to why. Two, there are profound differences between the two candidates for President, between the candidates for Senate and the House, differences that will have real consequences for how we live together in the years ahead. And three, only the Democrats want you to know what the differences are. *[Laughter]* Now, what does that tell you about who you ought to vote for?

What do I mean by that? First, it's a big election because we have an unprecedented moment of prosperity and it's not just economics. Crime is down. Welfare is down. Teen pregnancy is down. People are working together and dealing with each other as never before. We are a more just society than we were. Child poverty is down, minority unemployment the lowest ever recorded, female unemployment the lowest in 40 years, poverty among single-parent households the lowest in 46 years. This is a more just society. And we are more full of confidence. Moreover, we have no crippling domestic crisis or foreign threat.

So it's a big election because we have a chance, because of our prosperity, to build the future of our dreams for our children. But that's not automatic. That requires that instead of taking a relaxed view and sort of wandering through the election and wandering through the next couple of years, we have to say, "Hey, we might not ever have a chance like this again. We've got to seize the big opportunities and take on the big challenges that are out there."

And there are some big ones out there. You know them in Florida, and I'll just give you two of the biggest that you experience here to a greater degree than almost any other State. Number one, we've got the largest and most diverse group of students in our

schools in history, and they're not all getting a world-class education yet. Number two, we're living longer than ever before. If you live to be 65, your life expectancy is almost 83 now. And when all the baby boomers retire, there will only be about two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. We have to lengthen the life of Social Security. We have to lengthen the life of Medicare, and we have to add a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program.

And I might say, nobody has worked harder or more effectively to that end than Bob Graham. And everybody in Florida ought to know it and ought to be grateful for it.

Now, there are the challenges of the future—climate change. We worked so hard to save the Everglades. If we don't turn this global warming around, in 30 years a lot of it will be under water.

We've now sequenced the human genome. That's great. There are going to be unbelievable medical discoveries made. And pretty soon young women will bring their children home from the hospital with a little gene map, and before you know it, there are kids in this room whose children will have a life expectancy of 90 years or more when they're born. But do you think someone should be able to use your gene map to deny you a job, a promotion, a raise, or health insurance? I don't think so. We need someone in the White House and people in the Congress who understand science and technology.

The Internet revolution, people made fun of Al Gore over who invented the Internet, but he sponsored the legislation almost 20 years ago that took the Internet from being the private province of physicists and people involved in defense work to sweeping the world. And if it hadn't been for him, we wouldn't have gotten the E-rate in the telecommunications bill 4 years ago, which guarantees that every school, no matter how poor, can afford to have computers for their kids and be part of the Internet.

Now, there are big challenges out there. The outcome of this election will depend upon whether the American people believe what I just said, that it's a big election with big challenges and not a time to lay down and relax. You can just book it. When this is over, you read the election analyses in the

week after the election in November, and you remember what I told you tonight. The outcome of the election will depend upon what the American people believe the election is about, number one, and number two, whether they understand the differences.

On our side, we've got people like the Vice President and people like Bill Nelson, who did more with that insurance commissioner's job than anybody ever has, stopping fraud against seniors, enrolling children in the Children's Health Insurance Program, people who want to build on the progress of the last 8 years to make the changes of the future.

On their side, they've got their nominees for President and Vice President and others, who basically tell us that these are the best of times, and we're all going to have harmony and compassion and get along together, and the surplus that we've accumulated—that we're supposed to accumulate over the next 10 years—is your money, and they're going to give it back to you. And otherwise, they're kind of blurring the differences.

Bill's talking about how moderate his opponent sounds now. They're not bragging about shutting the Government down twice anymore or trying to shut the Department of Education down or having the biggest Medicare and education and environmental cuts in history. You never hear them talking about it anymore. Gone is the harsh rhetoric and the mean words of 1992 through 1999. Even the mean words of the 2000 primary against Senator McCain, that's all gone now. What are you to make of that? It's a very appealing package.

The first thing I want you to know is, I don't think this should be a mean election. I think we should say on the front end, we think our opponents are good, patriotic people, that they love their children, and they love their country. But they have honest differences. And this pretty package that they have presented is one they hope nobody will open until Christmas and certainly not before the November election. But there are real differences, and we want you to know what they are. And I'll just mention two or three tonight, but I want you to remember this because you've got to talk to people.

All these news stories that I've read say people don't know if there is any difference

between the Democrats and Republicans, between our nominees for President on economic policy. There was a huge article in the press last week surveying lots and lots of suburban women who care a lot about gun safety and they asked—the Vice President was ahead like six points in this poll among women who cared about this issue—then the person doing the poll, who doesn't work for either campaign, simply read their positions, and the numbers went from 45 to 39, to 57 to 29. So you can understand why they wouldn't want you to know what the real differences are, but you have to do that.

Let me just mention one or two. One, on the economy, here's our position. Our position is the American people should get a tax cut, but it ought to be one we can afford, because we still have to invest in education and health care and science and technology in providing for the future, number one; number two, because we still have to lengthen the life of Medicare and Social Security to get past the baby boomers' retirement, and we've got to provide that drug benefit; and number three, we've still got to keep paying down this debt and get this country out of debt to keep interest rates low so the economy will keep going.

Now, we have tax cuts that we admit, they're only about 25 percent, 30 percent of what theirs are. But they do more good for 80 percent of the people, for sending a kid to college, for long-term care, for child care, for retirement savings, for alleviating the marriage penalty. Eighty percent of the people or more are better off under ours. Moreover, because we continue to pay down the debt and they can't, interest rates will be at least a percent lower. Do you know what that's worth in tax cuts over a decade?—\$250 billion in lower home mortgages, \$30 billion in lower car payments, \$15 billion in lower college loan payments.

Now, that took me a while to say, didn't it? Theirs is so much easier. "Hey, this surplus is your money, and we're going to give it back to you." And that's what they do. If you take the tax cuts they've passed in the last year plus the ones that are in their platform that their nominee ran on, it takes up the whole surplus, the whole projected sur-

plus and then some, not a penny even for their own spending promises.

Now, quite apart from the obvious problems, like how do we spend 25 percent as much and give 80 percent of the people more, there is this: It is a projected surplus, projected. Did you ever get one of those letters in the mail from Publishers' Clearinghouse? Ed McMahon sends you a letter saying, "You may have won \$10 million." Well, if you went out the next day and spent the \$10 million, you should vote for them. But if not, you ought to stick with us to keep this prosperity going. *[Laughter]* Now, this is a big issue. No way to paper this over. This is a huge, gaping difference.

Secondly, on health care, we're for a Patients' Bill of Rights. We're for investing—I mean, a real one that means something—we're for investing whatever it takes—and it's not that much money—to lengthen the life of Medicare and to add this Medicare prescription drug benefit. We're for a not particularly costly tax break to let people between the ages of 55 and 65 buy into Medicare if they lose their health insurance. And we're for letting the parents of these—the low income parents of these kids that are in our Children's Health Insurance Program buy into the program if they don't have insurance.

Now, what's their program? They answer no to all these—no, no, no, no. And their Medicare drug program basically says that they'll help you if you're up to 150 percent of the poverty line but not if you're over, and you've got to buy private insurance. What's the problem with that?

The insurance companies, after all the fights we've had together—against each other over health care—I've got to brag on the health insurance companies. I want to brag on them. They have been up front and honest. They say, "This is a bad idea. You cannot offer a stand-alone drug policy that anyone will buy." Nevada passed a plan just like the ones that the Republicans are backing, and not a single, solitary insurance company has offered drug coverage under it because they don't want to be labeled frauds.

Now, why do they do it? Because the drug companies don't want us to buy all these drugs for seniors. Now, that seems counter-

intuitive. Normally, if you're in business, you want to sell as much as you can. But they fear that because we'll be buying a lot, we'll have a lot of bargaining power, and it will drive the price down, and people will only have to pay 25 percent more than they pay in every other country for American drugs. I just don't think it's a good reason. But it's a huge difference.

In education, we're for higher standards, requirements to turn around failing schools or shut them down, more teachers in the schools, more money for teacher training, more money for building or modernizing schools. Florida needs that bad, right? That's what we're for. They're for block grants and vouchers. That's what their program is.

In crime, we're for more police and closing the gun show loophole in the Brady bill, right? They have never supported the police program, even though it's given us the lowest crime rate in 25 years—never. And in the previous administration the President vetoed the Brady bill. Now, this group of people are against closing the gun show loophole. Their answer is, more people carrying concealed weapons, even in their houses of worship. Now that's not demagoguery, those are facts. That's their answer.

So the point I'm trying to make is you get to make a choice. And speaking of choice, that may be the biggest consequence of all. The next President will appoint two to four members of the Supreme Court, which is why it's important who's in the Senate because they have to confirm them. Al Gore is pro-choice and mainstream on basically preserving individual liberties and civil rights. And our judges are the most diverse group in history, but they have the highest ratings of the American Bar Association in 40 years. So they are confident, mainstream, and diverse.

Both their candidates on the national ticket are against the *Roe v. Wade* decision, and their nominee says his favorite judges are Justices Thomas and Scalia, the two most conservative on the Court. Those are his favorites.

Now, you have to—these are honorable people. I'll say again, they will do what they believe. How can you—you don't expect people to get elected President and not do what

they believe. You have to assume that you can trust them to follow their conscience and their lifelong positions.

Now, there won't be any talk about it probably this week, but this is a huge deal. The composition of the Supreme Court will change. And that Court will shape America well beyond the term of the next President, and this is a consequence. So what you have to tell your friends and neighbors is, look, these are just four I've given you, but if you look at—or five—education, health care, the economy, crime, and choice. Those are five. We could talk about the environment; I could give you lots of other issues, but you get the point.

Elections are choices that have consequences, and people must live with the consequences. So it is very important that they understand the choice. The American people always get it right if they have enough time and enough information. That's what you've got to believe. Otherwise, if they didn't nearly always get it right, we wouldn't be around here after 220 years.

So I say to you, this is a profoundly important election. There are big differences. You have to make sure people understand what their choices are. You don't have to say a bad word about our opponents. You can say that you, too, are sick of 20 years of negative politics, of trying to convince people that your opponent is just one step above a car thief. I know a little something about it. I don't like it very much. But that cannot be permitted to obscure the differences.

And I'll just say this in closing. I've lived long enough now to know that nothing stays the same forever. In my lifetime, we never had a chance like this. We can literally build the future of our dreams for our children. We can also be a more positive force around the world for peace and freedom and security and prosperity. But we can only do it if we make the right choices.

I want to say just one word about the Vice President. One of the things that bothers me is that the polls seem to say he gets no credit for our economic policy. Before I took office, we spent 2 months debating economic policy. You may remember I had a big national economic summit. When we had to decide whether we were going to make the brutally



tough decisions to get that deficit down, Al Gore was the first one to say, "We've got to do it. Let's just take the lumps and go on." When he cast the deciding vote on the economic plan of 1993, without which we could not have done any of the things we've enjoyed since, he acted on his conviction.

He was instrumental in the Telecommunications Act, which had a lot to do with creating hundreds of thousands of high-wage jobs. He supported all my trade initiatives. He has been there, an integral member of our economic team. He understands the future. That's important. You want a President who understands the future.

And finally, let me say the most important thing of all to me is he wants to take us all along for the ride. He is for a minimum wage; they are not. He is for employment non-discrimination legislation; they are not. He is for hate crimes legislation, and their leadership isn't because it also extends protection to gays. And I think that we need to be building an America where everybody that works hard plays by the rules and doesn't get in anybody else's way in a defensive way ought to be part of our America. That's what we think.

Now, people are free to think something else. But no one should be confused about the consequences. Now, I'm telling you, in my lifetime we've never had a chance like this. And I feel so good—in spite of all the good things that have happened in America in the last 7 years, I feel like we've been turning an ocean liner around in the ocean, and now it's headed in the right way, and it's about to become a speedboat. All the best stuff is still out there if we make the right choice. Bill Nelson is the right choice, and so is Al Gore.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Also, I want to tell you something else. When Grace got off the plane with Bill and I tonight, not a single soul saw either one of us. [Laughter] They said, "Who are those two old gray-haired guys with that beautiful woman in the red dress?" [Laughter] And she is also somebody that will do well in Washington.

Thank you very much. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:55 p.m. at the Colony Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Graham's wife, Adele; Bill Nelson, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate from Florida, and his wife, Grace; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush of Texas and Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney.

### **Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Dinner in Palm Beach**

*July 31, 2000*

Thank you very much. This is the fourth time that Bill and I have done this today, and we're about to get the hang of it. [Laughter] I want to thank Eric and Colleen for having us in their beautiful little home tonight, in this fabulous, fabulous tent. This is exhibit A for the proposition that if you want to live like a Republican, you should vote Democratic. [Laughter]

I want to thank the Aaronsons for having us earlier at the reception. I want to thank my great friend Alcee Hastings for being here and for representing Florida brilliantly in the House of Representatives.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to Bob Graham, who has been my friend for more than 20 years now. He and Adele and Hillary and I have been through a lot of interesting times together. And I've told anybody who cared to listen that the only job I ever could really hold down for any period of time was being Governor of my home State. I did that for 12 years, and I didn't seem to have much upward mobility for a while. But I had the good fortune to serve with 150 Governors and to see probably another 100 or more since then, since I've been President, and without any question, Bob Graham is one of the two or three ablest people I ever served with when he was Governor of this State. And he's done a fabulous job in Congress. I'll say more about that in a moment.

And I want to thank Bill Nelson and Grace for making this race for the Senate. It isn't easy to run for major office today. You never know what's going to hit you. You never know how difficult it will be, and you can't predict the twists and turns of the campaign. And he looks great right now, but when he made the decision, it might not have worked out

this way. He did it not knowing how it would come out because he believed he should serve.

And he and Grace have been friends of Hillary's and mine for a long, long time. They and their children have spent the night with us in the White House. I know them well, and I'm just so proud that people like that still want to serve, still want to give. Besides that, he's really been a good insurance commissioner. I mean, he stopped insurance fraud against the elderly. He helped children to get health insurance. He's really done a good job.

I also want to mention my good friend, your former Lieutenant Governor, Buddy MacKay, who is here with us tonight, who has really been great as our Ambassador to Latin America. And we just got a special bill passed to increase trade with the Caribbean region, which will be immensely helpful to the people here in south Florida. And I thank him for joining us today.

I would also just—I'd like to thank the people that catered this dinner and the people that served it. They made our dinner very nice tonight. Most of the time, people don't say that. So I thank them.

Let me say that I never know what to say at one of these dinners because I always feel that I'm preaching to the saved, as we say at home. I mean, if you weren't for him, surely you wouldn't have written a check. *[Laughter]* But I have a real interest in trying to get you to do more than write a check, because everybody who can come here is someone who, by definition, has a lot of contacts with a lot of people. And I'm very interested in how this whole election turns out. I'm passionately committed to the election of the Vice President, and I will say more about that in a minute.

And there is one Senate seat than I'm even more interested in than the Florida election, in New York—*[laughter]*—where the best person I've ever known is running. And the thing I'm thinking about tonight—and I just kind of want to talk to you—is, what is it that I could ask you to do that might make a difference in the election? And here's what it is. You can understand exactly what it's about and convince everybody you know that that's what it's about.

My experience over many years now in public life is that very often the outcome of an election is determined by what people think the election is about. And it may seem self-evident, but it isn't. For example, when I ran in 1992 and James Carville came up with that great line, "It's the economy, stupid"—well, he's great, but you didn't have to be a genius to figure that out. The country was in trouble, and we were going downhill economically. We had quadrupled our debt in 12 years. All of the social indicators were going in the wrong direction. Washington seemed paralyzed.

The political climate seemed to me in Washington, when I was way out in the country—at the time I was serving at what then President Bush called—I was the Governor of a small southern State. *[Laughter]* And I was so naive, I thought it was a compliment. *[Laughter]* And you know, I still do.

But anyway, it seemed to me like Washington, what happened in Washington was, that the Republicans and Democrats were saying, "You've got an idea. I've got an idea. Let's fight. Maybe we'll both get on the evening news," which got a lot of people on the evening news, but not much ever happened. And I didn't think anybody else lived that way.

So it was obvious that we had to try to turn the country around, and I won't go through all that. But I will say now we've had 8 years of the longest economic prosperity in our history, the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, 22 million new jobs. But it's not just economics. This is a more just society. Child poverty is down to a 20-year low, the lowest minority unemployment rate ever recorded, lowest female unemployment rate in 40 years, lowest single-parent household poverty rate in 46 years, welfare rolls cut in half, crime rate at a 25-year low, teen pregnancy down for 7 years in a row. The indicators are going in the right direction. This is a more just society and a stronger society.

And what I think the election ought to be about is this: Now what? Now, that may seem self-evident to you, but now what? What is it that we're going to do with all this prosperity? Are we just going to feel good about it? Are we going to take our cut and run?

Or are we going to recognize that this is something that happens once in a lifetime, and we had better think very hard about the chance we have been given to build the future of our dreams for our children, to seize the big opportunities, to meet the big challenges?

There's not a person in this beautiful setting tonight over 30 years of age who cannot recall at least one time in your life when you made a big mistake, not because things were going so badly but because things were going so well you thought there was no failure to the penalty to concentrate—the failure to concentrate. There was no penalty to that. If you failed to concentrate, you get distracted, who cares? Things are going so great, nothing can go wrong. And so you got to wandering around, and all of a sudden you made a mistake, something bad happened.

Now, countries are no different from people. So I say again—why am I telling you this? Because you read all the stories about this election—I read a huge story on the cover of *USA Today* a couple of weeks ago that said the voters had no idea that there was any significant difference between the Vice President and Governor Bush on economic policy. A big story in the *New York Times* last week on a survey, a national survey of suburban women voters who cared about gun safety legislation. They were for the Vice President only 45 to 39. Then the pollster, who doesn't work for any of us, not a politically affiliated person, simply read their positions on the issues to the people, and the poll changed from 49 to 35 to 50—45—39, excuse me, to 57 to 29. Boom, like that, just with information.

So what have we got? We've got a team headed by the Vice President, including Bill Nelson and Hillary and a lot of others who say, "Look, we've got to keep the prosperity going. We've got to keep investing in education, expanding trade, paying down the debt. We've got to have a tax cut, but one we can afford, so that we don't spend it all. And we've got to do some other things. We've got to lengthen the life of Medicare and Social Security so when the baby boomers retire, they don't bankrupt their kids and grandkids. We ought to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare because

it's unconscionable that all these seniors and disabled people who need these drugs can't get them, and we'd never create a Medicare program today without it. We ought to close the gun show loophole and do some other things to keep guns out of the hands of kids and criminals. We ought to do more to build one America. We ought to raise the minimum wage. We ought to pass employment nondiscrimination legislation. We ought to pass hate crimes legislation. We ought to preserve the fundamental individual liberties of the American people including the right to choose."

Now, on their side, they've got a team that basically says, "We used to be real conservative, but now we're moderate." [*Laughter*] Don't laugh. I'm not being cynical here. I'm being serious. And they talk about inclusion and compassion and harmony, but they don't talk much about specifics. And it's clear that they are greatly advantaged by the blurring of the lines between the two parties and the fact that people don't know what the differences are. So that's what I want to ask you to do. I want you to let me tell you, as much as a citizen, as a President, what I think the differences are and what I think is at stake.

First of all, on economic policy, our policy is pay down the debt, keep interest rates low, keep the economy going, invest in education and health care and science and technology, and have a tax cut we can afford, that 80 percent of the people will get more out of than theirs, even though it's only 25 percent as expensive, but most of you in this room wouldn't get more money out of it. You would, however, get lower interest rates, which the economists say our plan would give at least one percent lower interest rates for a decade—at least—which is worth, among other things, \$260 billion in home mortgages, \$30 billion in car payments, and \$15 billion in college loan payments, a pretty good size tax cut, not to mention, lower business loan rates, which means higher investment and greater growth and a stronger stock market.

Now, it took me a while to say that. Their case is a lot easier to make. Their case is, "Hey, we're going to have a \$2 trillion surplus. It's your money, and we're going to give it back to you." Doesn't that sound good?

In the last year they passed over a trillion dollars in tax cuts, and they've been pretty smart this year. They passed some sort of salami fashion so each one of them has a huge constituency. I like a lot of them, and I like some of all of what they're trying to do. The problem is it's kind of like going to a cafeteria. Did you ever go to a cafeteria to eat, and you got the tray, and you're walking down the aisle, and all the food looks so good? But if you eat it all, you'll get sick. [Laughter] You think about it.

So they proposed to spend the whole surplus, the whole projected surplus—never mind what they promised to spend in money. Now, what's wrong with that? Well, we tried it before, number one. Number two, it's a projected surplus.

Now, if you propose to spend some money and the money doesn't come in, you just don't spend it. But once you cut the taxes, they're cut. So they want to spend the entire projected surplus that we have worked as a country for 7 years to accumulate to turn around the deficits and debt. Now, it's projected; I don't know if it will come in or not.

It reminds me of—I told people at the previous meeting. Did you ever get one of those letters from Publishers' Clearinghouse in the mail signed by Ed McMahon? [Laughter] Did you ever get one? "You may have won \$10 million." You may have won it. Now, if the next day after you got that letter, you went out and spent the \$10 million, you should support them and their plan. [Laughter] But if you didn't, you had better stick with us. And that's what you need to tell people.

Nobody in their right mind—if I ask every one of you, whatever you do for a living, from the people who run the biggest companies here, the people that served our dinner, you think about this: What do you think your income is going to be over the next 10 years? What do you think it's going to be? Come to a very high level of confidence. Now, if I ask you to come up here right now and sign a binding contract to spend it all tonight, would you do it? If you would, you should support them. If not, you should stick with us. This is a huge difference, and all the surveys show the people don't know. You should help them know.

Let's take health care. We favor the Patients' Bill of Rights; they're against it. We favor a Medicare drug program that all our seniors can buy. They favor a private insurance program that, God bless them, the health insurance companies—I've fought them for 7 years, but I've got to take my hat off to them—[laughter]—they have been so honest. The health insurance companies have said, "Don't do this. It won't work. Nobody will do this. You can't offer policies."

In Nevada they passed a program like this, and not a single insurance company's even offered the policy. So they're not doing anything real for people who desperately need these drugs, the disabled people and seniors. And we've got the money now. It's unconscionable not to do it. If you live to be 65 years old now, your chance of your life expectancy is 83 in America. But it ought to be a good life. It ought to be a full life. If you're disable in America today and you can get the right kind of medicine, it can dramatically increase your capacity to work and to enjoy life and to be a full person to the maximum extent of your ability to do so. But you need medicine. This is a huge issue, especially in Florida, but throughout the country. They're not for it.

We say there are a lot of people who lose their health insurance when they're over 55 and they're not old enough for Medicare; we ought to give them a little tax break and let them buy in. They say no. So there's a big difference in health care policy.

Big difference in education policy. We say that we ought to have high standards, and people should turn around failing schools or have to shut them down, that we ought to have more teachers and more money for teacher training. We ought to spend more money to help places like Florida build new schools or repair old ones. They favor block grants and vouchers.

We say, on crime, we want more police in the high-crime areas, and we want to close the gun show loophole on the Brady background check law and require child safety locks on these guns and stop people importing these large capacity ammunition clips that allows people to convert legal weapons into assault weapons. And I say, and the Vice President says, you ought to get a photo ID

license before you get a handgun, showing that you passed the background check, you know how to use the gun safely. That's what we say.

Now, they think we're all wet. They think we're wrong. They think that all of that should be opposed, and what we really need is more people carrying concealed weapons, even in their places of worship. That's their record and their commitment.

We believe, as I said earlier, that we should raise the minimum wage; they don't. We favor the hate crimes legislation. Their leadership doesn't because it includes gays. I think that's one big reason we need it. I mean, how many people do we have to see get killed in this country because of who they are before we do that?

Same thing on employment non-discrimination laws. And as Bill said in a delicate way—and I'll be more blunt—maybe the biggest thing of all is the fact that the next President is going to appoint between two and four members of the U.S. Supreme Court, and it will change the face of America, one way or the other, long after the next President's term is finished. And on the one side, you've got the Vice President who believes in a woman's right to choose but also in the traditional commitment to civil rights and individual rights and responsibilities and the idea that the law ought to be a place where the weak as well as the strong can find appropriate redress.

And on the other side, you have two candidates who are firmly committed to the repeal of *Roe v. Wade*, and their Presidential candidate says the two judges he most admires are Justices Thomas and Scalia, by far the most conservative members of the Court.

Now, what's the point of this? We don't have to have a negative campaign. We should say, we think they are honorable people with wonderful families who love their children, who love their country, who want to do public service. But as honorable people, we should say, we expect them to do exactly what they say they're going to do even if they're not talking about it in this election. We can't pretend that these differences don't exist and that they aren't real and that they won't affect millions of people's lives.

Look at civil rights. You know, they've gotten in a lot of—at least a little stir lately because Mr. Cheney, when he was in Congress, voted against letting Nelson Mandela out of prison, and a lot of people are horrified to learn that. Now, he's a friend of mine and, I think, one of the greatest human beings I ever met. But to be fair, he did get out, and he's made a pretty good job of his life since he got out.

I'm not nearly as worried about Nelson Mandela 10 years ago as I am about some other minorities today. I'll tell you about Enrique Moreno. You don't know him. He grew up in El Paso without a lot, and got himself to Harvard, graduated summa cum laude, went home and became a lawyer. The judges out there in west Texas say he's one of the best lawyers in the region. I tried to put him on the Federal Court of Appeals in Texas. The ABA gave him a unanimous well-qualified rating. All the local folks were for him, the Republicans and the Democrats, they were all for him in the local level in El Paso.

But the Texas Republican Senators won't even give him a hearing. They say they don't think he's qualified. And the head of the Republican Party in Texas, now the head of the Republican Party in America, didn't lift a finger to get him a hearing. So I'd like to get Enrique Moreno out of this sort of political prison where he can't get a hearing.

In the southeast United States, more African-Americans live in the fourth circuit than any other one. There's never been a black judge on the fourth circuit. I've tried for 7 years to put an African-American judge in the fourth circuit. And the Republican Senators there are so opposed to this that they have allowed a 25 percent vacancy rate on that court. Now, they make all the decisions that don't quite get to the Supreme Court. Twenty-five percent vacancy rate because they don't want—ask Alcee Hastings if I'm telling the truth. Look at him nodding his head. It's unbelievable.

I want every American to know this. I've got two African-American judges now I've appointed. So I'm more concerned about those guys than Mandela. Mandela made a pretty good job of his life because, thank God, nobody listened to the vote that was

cast by the Republican nominee for Vice President. He did get out of jail, and he went on and made a great job as President of South Africa.

Look, what kind of country do you want, anyway? And again, what I want is a great election. I want people to be upbeat and happy and say, "Gosh, here we've got these perfectly fine people that are honorable, that are patriots, that want to serve their country, that have very different views. Here's what the differences are. Let's choose." If that's the way this election rolls out, you can book it. Al Gore will be the next President, and Bill Nelson will be the next Senator from the State of Florida.

But you cannot allow your fellow Floridians and any Americans you know anywhere else in the country to sort of sleepwalk through the election, sort of say, "Oh, well, this is just a fine time, and everything is great, and they all seem pretty nice. And this fraternity had it for 8 years, maybe we ought to give it to the other fraternity for a while." They've got a real pretty package here, the other side does, and they just hope nobody opens the package before Christmas. [Laughter]

And I say that not sarcastically. I don't blame them. It's a brilliant marketing strategy. It's the way they can win. But America is still here after 224 years because nearly all the time the people get it right if they have enough information and enough time. You can give it to them. You can go out and say, "Look, an election is a choice with consequences, and how a country deals with its prosperity is just as stern a test of its values, its judgment, and its character as how it deals with adversity. And we may never get a chance like this again to build a future of our dreams for our children."

And let me just close with this very personal note and show my age a little bit. In February when we broke the limit for the longest economic expansion in history, I asked my staff to tell me when the last longest economic expansion in history was. You know when it was? Nineteen sixty-one to 1969. I graduated from high school in 1964, before a lot of you were born, in the full flow of that longest economic expansion in history.

President Kennedy had just been killed, and we were all sad about that, but President Johnson was very popular. The country had a lot of confidence. We took the health of the economy for granted, low unemployment, low inflation, high growth. We thought the civil rights problems we had would be solved in the courts and the Congress, not on the streets. We never dreamed that Vietnam would get as big or as bloody or as divisive as it did. And we were just rolling along. Two years later we had riots in the streets all over America. Four years later I graduated from college in Washington, DC, 9 weeks after President Johnson couldn't run for President anymore and told us so, because of the division of the country over Vietnam, 8 weeks after Martin Luther King was murdered in Memphis, and 2 days after Robert Kennedy was murdered in Los Angeles. And the election and the national mood took a different turn. And before you know it, the last longest economic expansion in history was history.

I've lived long enough to know now nothing lasts forever. I have waited 35 years for my country to be in a position to truly build the future of our dreams for our kids. This kind of thing just comes along once in a great long while. And believe me, when you think of the implications in the human genome Project or the information revolution, all the things that are going out here, all the good things that have happened in the last 8 years, they are a small prolog to what is still out there. All the best things are still out there if we understand what our responsibility is in this election and if the voters understand what the choice is. Then we will not blow this, and when it's all done, we'll be very proud we didn't.

Thank you. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:12 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Eric and Colleen Hanson; Senator Graham's wife, Adele; Bill Nelson, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senate from Florida, and his wife, Grace; Palm Beach County District 5 Commissioner Burt Aaronson, his wife, Sheila, and son, Daniel; political consultant James Carville; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush of Texas and Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney.

**Proclamation 7332—Helsinki  
Human Rights Day, 2000**

*August 1, 2000*

*By the President of the United States  
of America*

**A Proclamation**

Twenty-five years ago today, in a world marked by brutal divisions and ideological conflict, the United States joined 33 European nations and Canada in signing the Helsinki Final Act. That watershed event established the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and affirmed an international commitment to respect “freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.”

During the Cold War, the Helsinki Principles were the rallying point for courageous men and women who confronted tyranny—often at great personal risk—to win the fundamental freedoms set forth by the Final Act. Today, citizens of our vast Euro-Atlantic community from Vancouver to Vladivostok live by, or aspire to live, by those fundamental freedoms. The Helsinki Final Act has been instrumental in the progress we have made together toward building a Europe that is whole and free; a Europe where our partnership for peace is overcoming the possibility of war. The Helsinki Final Act continues to shape our vision for the future of transatlantic cooperation, and the Helsinki accords remain the basic definition of common goals and standards for how all countries in the new Europe should treat their citizens and one another.

The evolution of the CSCE into the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) reflects the changing face of Europe. The OSCE’s integrated structure of commitments in the areas of human rights, economics, arms control, and conflict resolution provides a defining framework for a free and undivided Europe. The United States will continue to promote the OSCE’s efforts to build security within and cooperation among democratic societies; to defuse conflicts; to battle corruption and organized crime; and to champion human rights, fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law

throughout the Euro-Atlantic community. We remain committed to the OSCE’s essential work of bringing peace and civil society back to Bosnia and Kosovo, and we are grateful to the many dedicated men and women engaged in the OSCE’s field missions, who in many ways are our front line of conflict prevention in Europe.

Today, as we mark the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act, the United States takes pride in remembering our role as one of its original signatories—a ringing call for freedom and human dignity that played a decisive role in lifting the Iron Curtain and ending the tragic division of Europe.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim August 1, 2000, as Helsinki Human Rights Day and reaffirm our Nation’s support for the full implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. I urge the American people to observe this anniversary with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities that reflect our dedication to the noble principles of human rights and democracy. I also call upon the governments and peoples of all other signatory states to renew their commitment to comply with the principles established and consecrated in the Helsinki Final Act.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this first day of August, in the year of our Lord two thousand, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-fifth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., August 3, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 4.

**Statement on the Colorado Initiative  
To Close the Gun Show Loophole**

*August 2, 2000*

I commend the citizens of Colorado who took an important step today toward reducing gun violence by submitting nearly twice the number of signatures needed to place an

initiative on the State ballot to close the gun show loophole. Colorado voters can now do what Congress has failed to do: close a deadly loophole that allows criminals, juveniles, and other restricted persons to buy guns at gun shows with no questions asked.

With our Nation losing 10 children to gun-fire every day, Congress should heed the voices of millions of Americans concerned about gun violence—not those of the gun lobby—and follow the lead of States like Colorado. While Colorado's progress is encouraging, we should not have to rely on a patchwork of State laws when it comes to protecting our children's safety. Only Congress can pass legislation that protects children all across America. National legislation to close the gun show loophole and keep guns out of the wrong hands should be passed without further delay.

### **Statement on Signing the Cross-Border Cooperation and Environmental Safety in Northern Europe Act of 2000**

*August 3, 2000*

Yesterday, I signed H.R. 4249, the "Cross-Border Cooperation and Environmental Safety in Northern Europe Act of 2000." This law endorses the administration's Northern Europe Initiative (NEI) and highlights the need for continued international efforts to address the environmental dangers posed by nuclear waste in northwest Russia. I want to express my appreciation to Representative Sam Gejdenson for introducing and ensuring the passage of this important legislation.

We launched the Northern Europe Initiative because we recognized, as the Congress does in this law, the importance of strengthening regional cooperation among the Baltic States, Russia, and all countries bordering the Baltic Sea. Only in this way can we create the stability and prosperity that will lead to full integration of northern Europe, including northwest Russia, into the broader European and transatlantic mainstream. Our European friends, especially the Nordic countries and the European Union, are full partners in this effort.

The law also highlights the environmental dangers posed by military nuclear waste in northwest Russia. These dangers have been brought to light by the work of courageous independent environmentalists and non-governmental organizations in Russia and elsewhere. Aleksandr Nikitin, a retired Russian Navy colonel, has made important contributions to the international understanding and study of environmental problems in this region. Both environmentalists and non-government organizations face increased challenges today.

We have been deeply involved in helping Russia and its neighbors confront the serious environmental risks that face the Barents Sea, the Baltic Sea, and the people who live around them. We look forward to increased cooperation from Russia as we create a legal framework for our common efforts.

NOTE: H.R. 4249, approved August 2, was assigned Public Law No. 106-255.

### **Statement on the Death of Sister M. Isolina Ferre**

*August 3, 2000*

Hillary and I were saddened to learn of the death of Sister Isolina Ferre. Her passionate fight, for more than 60 years, against poverty, violence, and despair earned her many awards and countless tributes from all around the world. Armed only with her faith, she taught gangs in New York City to solve their differences without violence. In Puerto Rico, her community service centers, the Centros Isolina Ferre, transformed ravaged neighborhoods by operating clinics and helping residents to empower themselves.

Almost a year ago today, I was honored to welcome Sister Isolina to the White House and present her with the Medal of Freedom. At that ceremony, I said, "Sister Isolina taught people to see the best in themselves and in their communities and made sure they had the tools to make the most of the gifts God has given them."

Her lifetime of selfless commitment to others will remain her greatest legacy. Our thoughts and prayers are with her family and many friends.



**Statement on Federal Action on  
Potential Electricity Shortages in  
California**

*August 3, 2000*

Today I am directing all Federal agencies to take steps to reduce consumption of electricity in California to the maximum extent possible. As one of the largest power consumers in California, it is critical that the Federal Government take every possible step to reduce non-essential power consumption at Federal facilities in the State.

During power shortage emergencies, it also is important that we increase our generation of power in the West, much of which is supplied to California customers. Therefore, I also am directing that Federal agencies that generate power, and the Federal Power Marketing Administrations, take all possible steps to maximize the amount of electricity that can be delivered to California.

These short-term measures will assist California utilities and consumers in meeting electricity needs during this critical period.

**Memorandum on Potential  
Electricity Shortages in California**

*August 3, 2000*

*Memorandum for the Heads of Executive  
Departments and Agencies*

*Subject: Potential Electricity Shortages in  
California*

The increased demand for electricity during summer heat waves can make it a challenge for electric utilities to meet the demands of their customers. Currently, the supply of electric power is tight in California due to record demand for electricity. The State faces the possibility of rolling blackouts in some areas. These conditions put both consumers and businesses at risk.

The Federal Government is among the largest consumers of electricity in California. It is important that we lead by example in taking energy-conserving steps to reduce the

risk and severity of power outages. Therefore, I direct that:

- Managers of Federal buildings in California take steps to reduce consumption of power to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the health and welfare of employees; and,
- Federal agencies coordinate with other State and local government agencies to minimize the use of electricity in all government buildings in California.

Further, although most of the electricity in the Western United States is generated and marketed by privately and publicly owned utilities, the Federal Government also generates and markets electricity in the region. For the duration of the current power shortage emergency, I direct that:

- Federal agencies that generate electricity take all possible measures, consistent with existing laws and regulations, to maximize the amount of electricity that can be delivered to California; and,
- Federal Power Marketing Administrations take all steps necessary to maximize the availability of electricity in California.

I also direct Federal agencies to work with the State of California to develop procedures governing the use of backup power generation in power shortage emergencies.

Although these are important steps that can help reduce the risk of power shortages in the short term, we need a more comprehensive approach for the long term. I therefore further direct each of you to continue working towards the goals of Executive Order 13123, Greening the Government Through Efficient Energy Management, and to continue working with the Congress on comprehensive electricity restructuring legislation, which can promote greater investment in generation and transmission facilities, enhance the efficiency of the interstate transmission grid, and promote energy efficiency programs.

**William J. Clinton**

## **Statement Announcing an Upcoming Visit and Further Assistance to Colombia**

*August 4, 2000*

I am pleased to announce I will travel on August 30 to Colombia to meet with President Andres Pastrana and to personally underscore America's support for Colombia's efforts to seek peace, fight illicit drugs, build its economy, and deepen democracy. I am delighted that Speaker Dennis Hastert and Senator Joe Biden, two longtime champions of peace and democracy in Colombia, will join me on the trip.

Colombia's success is profoundly in the interest of the United States. A peaceful, democratic, and economically prosperous Colombia will help to promote democracy and stability throughout the hemisphere.

I have also signed a Presidential decision directive ordering, as a matter of national priority, an intensified effort to aid the Colombian Government in implementing Plan Colombia—President Pastrana's bold plan to build a better future for his country.

The Presidential decision directive complements and supports the \$1.3 billion assistance package that I requested from Congress, and that Democrats and Republicans passed in a bipartisan spirit last month. The cornerstone of our Colombia initiative, this supplemental includes a tenfold increase in U.S. funds to promote good government, judicial reform, human rights protection, and economic development in Colombia. It will help Colombia strengthen its democracy while helping the Government staunch the flow of drugs to our shores.

This directive, along with the sharp increase in funding from Congress, will intensify our efforts to help the Colombian Government implement its comprehensive national strategy. It is the right way to advance America's interests in the region, and I am proud of the bipartisan effort that has made it possible.

---

## **Digest of Other White House Announcements**

---

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

---

### **July 29**

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton participated in a staff picnic on the South Lawn at the White House. Later, they traveled to New York City, arriving in the afternoon.

Later, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Chappaqua, New York.

### **July 30**

In the morning, the President traveled to Chicago, IL, and in the evening, he returned to Washington, DC.

### **July 31**

In the morning, the President traveled to Tampa, FL. In the afternoon, he visited the National Football League Tampa Bay Buccaneers training camp facility.

In the evening, the President traveled to Coral Gables, FL.

### **August 1**

In the afternoon, the President returned to Washington, DC, arriving in the evening.

The President announced his intention to appoint Craig J. Mundie as a member of the National Security Telecommunications Advisory Committee.

The President announced his intention to appoint G. William Ruhl as a member of the National Security Telecommunications Advisory Committee.

### **August 2**

In the morning, the President was interviewed by telephone by former Senator John Danforth, the Justice Department-appointed Waco Special Counsel, concerning the investigation into events surrounding the 1993 incident in Waco, TX.

The President signed new Federal guidelines governing petitions for executive clemency regarding death row inmates convicted in Federal capital cases.

The President announced his intention to appoint Joe C. Adams to the President's Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

### **August 3**

The President announced his intention to nominate David W. Ogden to be Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division at the Department of Justice.

The President recess appointed Carl Spielvogel as Ambassador to the Slovak Republic.

The President recess appointed Robin Chandler Duke as Ambassador to Norway.

The President recess appointed James A. Daley as Ambassador to Barbados, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Kitts and Nevis, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

The President recess appointed Bill Lann Lee as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights at the Department of Justice.

The President announced the recess appointment of Sue Bailey as Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration at the Department of Transportation. Ms. Bailey was nominated on July 25, 2000, and her nomination is currently pending before the Senate.

The President announced the recess appointment of Francisco J. Sanchez as Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs at the Department of Transportation. Mr. Sanchez was nominated on June 8, 2000, and his nomination is currently pending before the Senate.

The President announced the recess appointment of Ella Wong-Rusinko as Alternate Federal Co-Chair of the Appalachian Regional Commission. Ms. Wong-Rusinko was nominated on March 23, 2000, and her nomination is currently pending before the Senate.

The President recess appointed Art Campbell as Assistant Secretary for Economic Development at the Department of Commerce. Mr. Campbell was nominated to the U.S. Senate on March 22, 2000.

The President recess appointed Franz S. Leichter as a member of the Federal Housing Finance Board. Mr. Leichter was nominated to the U.S. Senate on June 8, 1999.

The President announced the recess appointment of W. Michael McCabe as Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Mr. McCabe was nominated on November 16, 1999, and his nomination is currently pending before the Senate.

The President recess appointed Sally Katzen as Deputy Director for Management at the Office of Management and Budget.

The President recess appointed Randolph D. Moss as Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice.

The White House announced that the President will award the Presidential Medal of Freedom during an August 9 ceremony at the White House to James Edward Burke, the late Senator John Chafee, Gen. Wesley K. Clark, USA (Ret.), Adm. William Crowe, USN (Ret.), Marian Wright Edelman, John Kenneth Galbraith, Msgr. George G. Higgins, Rev. Jesse Jackson, Mildred (Millie) Jeffrey, Mathilde Krim, George McGovern, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Cruz Reynoso, Rev. Gardner C. Taylor, and Simon Wiesenthal.

### **August 4**

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Martha's Vineyard, MA, and in the evening, they traveled to Nantucket, MA.

Later, the President and Hillary Clinton returned to Martha's Vineyard.

The President recess appointed George T. Frampton, Jr., as Chair and Member of the Council on Environmental Quality. Mr. Frampton was nominated to the U.S. Senate on February 2, his nomination is currently pending before the Senate.

The President recess appointed John D. Holum as Secretary for Arms Control and International Security Affairs at the Department of State. Mr. Holum was nominated to the U.S. Senate on March 5, 1999, and his nomination is currently pending.

The President recess appointed Robert S. LaRussa as Under Secretary for International

Trade at the Department of Commerce. Mr. LaRussa was nominated to the United States Senate on May 25, 2000.

---

### **Nominations Submitted to the Senate**

---

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

---

### **Checklist of White House Press Releases**

---

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

#### ***Released August 2***

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's interview with Waco Special Counsel John Danforth

#### ***Released August 3***

Statement by the Press Secretary announcing that the President will award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to 15 distinguished individuals on August 9

Fact sheet: Export Controls on Computers

#### ***Released August 4***

Fact sheet: Presidential Decision Directive on the Colombia Initiative: Increased U.S. Assistance for Colombia

---

### **Acts Approved by the President**

---

#### ***Approved August 2***

H.R. 1791 / Public Law 106-254  
Federal Law Enforcement Animal Protection Act of 2000

H.R. 4249 / Public Law 106-255  
Cross-Border Cooperation and Environmental Safety in Northern Europe Act of 2000